

Campbellism Revealed

—BY—


REV. G. W. POOL.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.


Chap. _____ Copyright No. 173 _____


Shelf _____

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.









CAMPBELLISM REVEALED;

OR,

SALVATION BY FAITH

VERSUS

SALVATION BY WATER.


BY

REV. G. W. POOL,

OF

THE IOWA CONFERENCE.

CHICAGO :
DONOHUE & HENNEBERRY,
PRINTERS AND BINDERS.
1892.



BX7321
P6

COPYRIGHT, 1891,

BY

G. W. POOL.



PREFACE.

The ministry of the orthodox churches in general have deemed the doctrines and assumptions of Campbellism to be too absurd to need any serious refutation. The prevailing opinion seems to be that this system of error is so intrinsically weak that it will die of itself if it is totally disregarded. But under this treatment this church has greatly increased in numbers and power, until it is next to impossible to accomplish any spiritual work where it has secured a permanent foothold. We have been trusting altogether in the goodness of our cause; and, in the meantime, books and pamphlets advocating these errors have multiplied, while scarcely anything has been written in defense of the truth. It was the great zeal in disseminating these views, and the increasing number of the publications on the one side, and the seeming indifference and almost dearth of literature on the other, that called forth these pages.

Having felt for some time the need of an inexpensive and unpretentious work exposing this doctrinal system, and not being able to find a book of this description, I finally determined to write one myself. I have not written, however, because I make any pretension to scholarship, or have any ambition for authorship; but because I desired to aid in offsetting the pernicious influence of this system of faith. It may be needless for me to say that I have written for the sincere inquirer after truth of ordinary ability, and not for the learned. And I will not be surprised if some should think it presumptuous for a writer of such inferior qualifications to offer an additional book to the public. But a work of inferior claims may find readers, in con-

PREFACE.

sequence of local circumstances drawing attention to it, where a superior work would be overlooked. And this is an opportunity for doing good that ought not to be lost.

Quotations from the "Christian System" have been placed at the beginning of the most of the chapters, in order that the reader might have the privilege of examining for himself the teachings of Campbellism as set forth in the language of its author, and that there might be no possibility of accusing me of misrepresentation. I do not wish to be misunderstood. I believe that there are some of these people who have risen above this system, and are Christians in spite of the doctrines they hold; for these I have the utmost respect, but I have no respect, whatever, for the doctrines themselves.


Other books have been freely consulted in the preparation of these pages. All of those from which I have received aid can not be mentioned here, except in this general way, but I am especially indebted to the learned author of "Errors of Campbellism."

The writer hopes that the effort he has made to reveal this doctrinal scheme in its true light may not be labor spent in vain, but that this little volume, which is now sent forth on its mission, may be the means of establishing many more firmly in the truth; and that it may, at least, lead some earnest seekers after the way of life to embrace the evangelical doctrine of salvation by faith.

G. W. P.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER.	PAGE.
I. THE ORIGIN OF CAMPBELLISM, - - -	7
II. THE CREED OF CAMPBELLISM, - - - -	14
III. THE DOCTRINES OF CAMPBELLISM, - -	24
IV. BAPTISMAL REMISSION—NOT COMMANDED, -	32
V. BAPTISMAL REMISSION—NOT SCRIPTURAL, -	47
VI. BAPTISMAL REGENERATION—ITS IMPOSSIBILITY,	66
VII. BAPTISMAL REGENERATION—ITS ABSURDITY, -	84
VIII. IS IMMERSION THE MODE OF BAPTISM? - -	99
IX. IS IMMERSION SCRIPTURE BAPTISM? - -	118
X. THE SPIRIT OR THE WORD—WHICH? - - -	139
XI. HISTORICAL FAITH, - - - - -	157
XII. SALVATION BY FAITH ONLY, - - - -	168



CAMPBELLISM REVEALED.

CHAPTER I.

THE ORIGIN OF CAMPBELLISM.

“Tired of new creeds and new parties in religion, and of the numerous abortive efforts to reform the reformation; convinced from the Holy Scriptures, from observation and experience, that the union of the disciples of Christ is essential to the conversion of the world and that the correction and improvement of no creed, or partisan establishment in Christendom, could ever become the basis of such a union, communion, and co-operation as would restore peace to a church militant against itself, or triumph to the common salvation, a few individuals, about the commencement of the present century, began to reflect upon the ways and means to restore primitive Christianity.”

Christian System, page 5.

Before entering fully into the discussion of the doctrines held by this pseudo Christian Church, it will be well, in order that the reader may have a better understanding of the subject, to give a brief sketch of its rise and progress as a distinctive doctrinal system.

Its origin was on this wise: Thomas Campbell, a minister of the Presbyterian Church of Ireland, emigrated to America in the year 1807; and shortly after his arrival here, he identified himself with the

Secession branch of the Presbyterian Church, in Western Pennsylvania. He had not, however, preached but a short time in this denomination until charges were preferred against him for the violation of the usages of the church, in regard to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. He was tried, found guilty, and condemned; but he appealed his case to the Synod, and was released from condemnation, on account of irregularities in the proceedings. But at the same time a committee was appointed to investigate the charges, and it brought in a report censuring him for his disregard of the usages of the Church, which caused him to withdraw from the Seceders.

It seems that he now conceived the idea of restoring primitive Christianity by destroying all the creeds, and uniting all denominations on a scriptural bond of union. And in 1809, he and a few others of similar views met and organized the Christian Association of Washington. The purpose of this organization, according to its "Declaration and Address," was to perfect the project of uniting all sects upon the proposition that they should have, "either in express terms or in approved precedent, a 'thus saith the Lord,' for every article of faith and item of religious practice." In the fall of this year, Thomas Campbell was joined in this country by his eldest son, Alexander, who, by his decided character, his

liberal education, and his ability as a polemic theologian, was destined, more especially, to be the founder of this new system of faith. He at once espoused the peculiar views of his father, and in 1810 began to preach, it seems without the proper authority; for, about this time, Thomas Campbell made application to unite with the Pittsburgh Synod of the Presbyterian Church, and was refused admission, because, among other reasons, Alexander Campbell had been permitted to exercise his gifts of public speaking without ordination.

This failure to gain admittance into the Regular Presbyterian Church led to the organization of the Christian Association of Brush Run, in Washington county, Pennsylvania. At the first session of this Association, Alexander Campbell was licensed to preach, and was ordained by his father. Soon after its organization, a member of the Brush Run Church asked the question: "Is infant baptism scriptural?" The question was discussed by the father and son, and not being able to find a "thus saith the Lord" for the practice, it was discarded. And while they were investigating this subject, they were led to consider carefully the grounds for baptism by affusion, and they became convinced that immersion alone was the scriptural mode of baptism. And on the twelfth day of June, 1812, Alexander Campbell, his

father, and their adherents were immersed by Elder Luce of the Baptist Church.

In the latter part of the following year, the Brush Run organization formed a union with the Red-Stone Association of the Baptist Church. But they were never in perfect accord with the Baptists—these differences, Alexander Campbell insisted upon—and, in 1823, he was compelled to withdraw from them to escape expulsion for heresy. Near the close of this year, in a public debate with Mr. Calla, according to his own statement, he preached, for the first time, that water baptism was a necessary condition to the pardon of sins. It was eleven years from his immersion to the time he arrived at the point where he taught, that the design of baptism was for the remission of sins. In the spring of this same year, he had begun the publication of the *Christian Baptist*, which finally gave place to the *Millennial Harbinger*. In these papers, he developed his doctrinal scheme of salvation by water. He so gradually changed his views, and so greatly were the people infatuated with him, that they accepted this doctrine as gospel truth as soon as he proclaimed it.

Campbellism now enters the field of controversy with a baptismal shiboleth by which it decapitates the members of all other churches without regard, either to their doctrines, or to their Christian integrity. Mr. Campbell had great ability as a public

debater, and gloried in theological discussions as a means of disseminating his doctrines. And at first he was very successful, owing to the fact that his opponents were not acquainted with his doctrines, or his method of defending them, while he had access to their theological works, therefore was able to meet and offset their arguments. They sought to overthrow his doctrine of baptismal remission by showing that justification was by faith, while he destroyed the force of their arguments by sophistry, and, at the same time, declared baptism to be the only necessary condition to salvation. His followers always believed that he was victorious; and so great was their zeal in spreading the doctrinal views of their leader that the growth of this new sect was phenomenal. No sooner had a person embraced this faith and emerged from the water, than he was ready to dispute on the subject of religion with the first man he met. And as they claimed to take the Bible as their only creed, they drew largely from those Churches which held kindred doctrines. Its doctrines being regarded by evangelical Christians as too absurd to need refutation, it was left to flourish without opposition; and it has increased in numbers and influence until it has become a large, strong and vigorous system of religious formalism.

This system of faith is justly called Campbellism, and its advocates are appropriately designated as

Campbellites. But they regard it as a grave insult to their dignity, and a reproach upon their character to be thus distinguished. They profess to be guided by the Bible alone, and will neither acknowledge any man as their founder, nor consent to be known by any name except "The Christian Church." They hold that all the Churches that have a distinctive denominational name are followers of men, while they alone are the followers of Christ. By making the exclusive claim that they are "The Christians," and charging all those who have had the modesty to take a distinctive name with being the followers of men, they unchristianize the members of all other Churches. It is nonsense to assert that we can in no sense be followers of the opinions of men, and at the same time be followers of Christ. If other denominations received the opinions of men as substitutes for, or in opposition to, the Word of God, they might have some grounds for opposing the use of distinctive appellations, but this they do not do. The opinions of men are received, not because they are contrary to the Bible, but because they are believed to be the true interpretations of its teachings.

The name "Christian Church" is no more a divinely appointed name than any other appellation that is used to distinguish the followers of Christ. It is true that the "disciples were called Christians first at Antioch," and that the word Church fre-

quently occurs in the New Testament, but never do they appear together. A man is still a citizen of the United States, though he may be known by the name of the State in which he resides. Because he is a Virginian or a Missourian, it does not make him a foreigner. The name Christian belongs to the universal Church of Christ, and because a person belongs to one of the many branches of the Christian Church, and is called by the name of Baptist, Methodist, or Presbyterian, he does not forfeit his Christian character. Chrysostom, while preaching to the Antiochians, once told them, with a stroke of his Greek wit, that though they had invented the Christian name, they left others to practice the Christian virtues. And it is equally true with these people, though they contend for the Christian name, they let those who distinguish themselves by a distinctive denominational name practice the Christian virtues. In taking the name "Christian Church," and refusing to be otherwise designated, they show an arrogance which, it is doubtful, if it ever has been excelled. And from thus designating, them, and thereby unchristianizing all those, who by their Christ-like lives, have so much better right to the title: "I pray thee have me excused."

CHAPTER II.

THE CREED OF CAMPBELLISM.

“Every party in Christendom, without respect to any of its tenets, opinions or practices, is a *heresy*, a schism—unless there be such a party as stand exactly upon the Apostles’ ground. Then, in that case, it is a sect just in the sense of the old sect of the Nazarenes, afterward called *Christians*, and all others are guilty before the Lord, and must be condemned for their opposition to Christ’s own party; whose party we are, provided we hold fast all, and only all, the apostolic traditions, and build upon the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible.”

Christian System, p. 104.

The advocates of Campbellism violently oppose all printed creeds as being pernicious in their influence and productive only of sectarian divisions. Hence no opportunity is permitted to pass to denounce their sinfulness, and the enthralling character of all disciplinary requirements. This doubtless is the result of a misapprehension of the true nature and design of creeds. When they associate with creeds what does not properly belong to them, and assign to them a purpose which they are not intended to serve, it is not surprising that these persons have developed such an unjust prejudice against them.

In order that we may have a proper understanding of this subject, it will be well for us to first inquire

What is a creed? The word is derived from *credo*, I believe. It is declarative and not imperative. I believe, and not thou shalt believe. Every man has a right to think for himself and to form his own belief, and under proper circumstances he has the right to express his belief. And every man that has a belief, no matter what it is, has a creed. And the belief, or creed, of any individual may become the belief or creed of any number of individuals; therefore men of similar belief, of the same creed, in science, politics, and religion, unite in order to accomplish the same end. And they welcome to their society, party, or sect, men of similar views, who will co-operate harmoniously with them in their work; but men of conflicting views, who would create discord and hinder their work, they wisely exclude. A Church creed is a declaration of the belief of the members of a particular Church, or an association of Churches, with regard to the fundamental doctrines of Christianity.

The question is, has a Church the right to formulate a creed, setting forth its views of these doctrines, in a general, or more minute form? In answer to this question we will ask another, has any individual the right, in the exercise of his private judgment, to form and express his belief in regard to the teachings of the Word of God? It must be conceded that every man has a right to do this. But if one man has

this right, two men, a score of men, any number of men either individually or unitedly, have the same right. Because men unite in Church fellowship for mutual assistance and co-operation in religious work, they do not thereby lose their individual right to think for themselves, and to declare their belief in regard to the teachings of the Scriptures. If each member of the Church possesses this right, and their views harmonize, the declaration of belief, or creed of one, is the declaration of belief, or creed of all; for the right that inheres in each one separately, inheres in all unitedly. The truth of this is too obvious to be denied. Therefore there can be no question as to the right of a Church to declare its belief in the form of a written creed. And if a single individual, who, in the exercise of his right of private judgment, forms his belief of the doctrines taught in the Bible, is not "guilty before the Lord." then no guilt attaches to a number of individuals associated together as a Church, who, in the exercise of this same right, form and express their belief of these doctrines.

Every Church has a creed, either written or unwritten, and the church founded by Alexander Campbell is no exception to this general rule. Though it is not expressed in articles of religion, or definite formulas of doctrine, yet it is a creed as really commanding the assent of every one seeking admission into this church as any creed in existence. While

they earnestly protest against creeds and sectarianism, it is doubtful that if among all other denominations there can be found a Church with a more exclusive creed than this so-called Christian Church. It is surprising how these people have ever deceived themselves into the belief that their system of doctrines is anything more than any other creed of human origin. In the first place, they have an oral creed consisting of only three articles, yet it is so exceedingly narrow that it excludes a large majority of the most holy and devout Christians in the world from the Church. And, as unreasonable as it may seem, there is not in the whole Bible a "thus saith the Lord" for a single article of it. The first article, to which those seeking fellowship with this church must subscribe verbally, is the confession, "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." The second article of this faith is the belief that immersion alone is baptism. And the third article of their creed is the belief that baptism is a necessary condition to the remission of sins. The only passage of Scripture that gives any grounds for requiring the confession that Christ was the Son of God is the reply of the Ethiopian eunuch in Acts viii., 37; but it is regarded as spurious by the ablest critics, and is not found in the Revised Version. A person may accept the first and last article of this creed, but if he holds that affusion is baptism, it is impossible for

him to gain admission into their Church. He might accept the first two, but unless he subscribed to the last one also, he would not be received. They will not receive a person on his letter from another Church, except perhaps from the Baptist Church they will sometimes recognize a letter, but it is done in order to proselyte. For they rejoice more over the acquisition of a member from another church than over that of ninety-and-nine sinners that need repentance.

But this is not all their creed, with them, like other denominations, a large part of their belief is set forth in the general consensus of their doctrinal writers. The founder of this system of faith presents the doctrinal views and polity of his Church in the work entitled "The Christian System." And this book is as complete a doctrinal and disciplinary guide for the people of this faith as the discipline or confession of faith of any other church. It is true that their societies have never formally adopted it as their book of discipline, because, according to the teachings of their founder, every particular society is independent of all others. Hence it is always possible for them to deny that they have any authoritative discipline such as other Churches have. But notwithstanding this fact, there is not a society among them which does not receive the doctrines just as they are taught in this book, and is not gov-

erned by the disciplinary rules laid down by their great leader in it from page 85-90.

Mr. Campbell completely stamped his peculiar doctrinal views, their mode of inculcation, and even their method of defense, upon his followers. And while other Churches may change their creeds by their legislative bodies, this Church can never change its creed, for the founder of the system has been its sole legislator. And as its doctrines and polity were evolved from the New Testament by him, they must be held sacred by them for all time.

The advocates of this system claim that creeds have been the cause of all the schisms in the Church, and have given rise to the many different sects that are now found in the Christian world. Hence they hold that a union between these various sects can never be consummated, except by destroying all their creeds, and taking the Bible alone as their creed. But are creeds the cause of the divisions and strife in the Church? There are many different creeds in existence, but what was it that led to their adoption? If there ever was a time when the views of the church were in perfect oneness, when all of its members held the same belief in regard to the teaching of the Scriptures, it is certain that such a unity of sentiment could not give birth to different creeds; for as long as a unity of faith continued only

one creed was possible. It was by the exercise of the right of private judgment, that members of the church came to have divergent views of the doctrines of Christianity. They must necessarily have held these views before they expressed them, or any one else either accepted or rejected them; therefore, creeds were only made possible by the previous existence of dissordant views in the church. To assume that creeds have caused men to differ in their belief, and brought about all the schisms in the church is to suppose that an effect has produced its cause. These conflicting views were first conceived, then expressed, and finally became the creed of those who accepted them. And if these teachers could accomplish their designs and annihilate every creed in Christendom, it would not bring about permanent christian union, unless at the same time they took away men's power to think and act for themselves. History would simply repeat itself, men would form different opinions of what the Bible teaches, those of similar views would unite and formulate a creed, and it would not be long until there would be as many denominations as there are at the present.

But creeds instead of producing discord and schism are essential to secure peace and harmony within the Church; for without them there would be friction, conflict, and disruption. The word sect

is not a name of ignominy ; it means nothing more than a number of individuals associated in the belief of some common doctrines. And no matter how heretical the doctrines which it holds may be, they are all claimed to be based upon the teaching of God's Word. There is not a denomination in the land that could not honestly say : "The Bible is our creed ; its precepts our guide ; and its doctrines our theology." Hence it becomes necessary, in order that the world may know what doctrines a Church holds, for it to make a declaration of its belief in the form of a creed. If there are no doctrines in Christianity that can be formulated into articles of religion, no fundamental principles, no confessed beliefs, it is equivalent to the admission that there is no Christian faith. And as antagonistic elements can not be made to unite and harmonize, therefore it becomes the duty of Christian men associated together as a Church to exclude from their fellowship men of discordant views, whose presence among them would produce division and strife. And in doing this they neither invade any man's rights, nor bind his conscience. No denomination demands of a man that he shall accept her faith. He can either accept it or reject it as he pleases. But a Church has a right to say to every one seeking her fellowship ; "This is what we believe, and if your views are in accord with ours we will gladly

receive you, but if they are not we cannot receive you." This does not involve the person's salvation, or even his membership in some other Church of similar views with himself. It leaves every man free to think and act for himself, while at the same time it preserves the peace and harmony of the Church.

The assumed rejection of all human creeds by the advocates of this system greatly aids them to impress their doctrinal ideas upon the people as the very essence of the gospel. Perhaps they honestly believe that they, in their system, are entirely free from all human leadership, and that the Bible alone is their creed. But who are the interpreters of God's Word? They of course claim this privilege for themselves, and pass sentence of condemnation on all that can not understand the Scriptures as they do. Therefore their doctrines must be infallible deductions from the Word of God, or else their claim to take the Bible as their sole guide is groundless; and they only take their interpretation of it for their creed, which is just what all other denominations do, and nothing more.

It is truly amazing with what assurance these teachers will present their doctrinal scheme as the one of divine institution, and offer it as the only basis upon which the Christian world can unite. They deliberately chose the rite of baptism, about which there has been more controversy and honest

division of opinion in the Church than any other question; and declare that it is by one mode—immersion—for one purpose—the remission of sin. Then they invite the people to leave or avoid the sects, stop all their disputing, and come forward and accept the final settlement of this vexed question by joining the Christian Church. In other words, they say to all other Christians, “Give up your creeds and accept our faith, and we will receive you into our fellowship, and then we will have union.” It is doubtful if there can be found among all other denominations a Church that shows so much arrogance in its claims, is so exclusive in its creed, and that has such profound confidence in its theories as the one that professes to build “upon the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible.” It is implicit in credulity, and insolent in assertion. It regards the very existence of other denominations as a crime, and calls upon the people to rally around the standard of absolute freedom from creeds, while it has a creed itself that is so narrow that it will exclude nine-tenths of the Christian world from the Church. It claims to be free from sectarianism, but it is full of coarse intolerance. It is an inquisition with such tortures as the spirit of the times still renders possible.

CHAPTER III.

THE DOCTRINES OF CAMPBELLISM.

"The Christian party is built on the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, and on Jesus the Messiah, himself the chief corner stone, and therefore *on the Christian Scriptures alone*. Now all other parties that are in any way diverse from the Christian party are built upon some alloy—some creed, formula, or human institution supplementary to the apostolic laws and customs. This alloy is what makes the party. So many items of the Apostles, doctrine and so many notions of Calvin combined produce the combine called Calvinism. So many items of Luther's opinions, compounded with the Apostles' teaching, make Lutheranism. and so many portions of Wesley's speculations compounded; with certain portions of the New Testament, make the compound called Methodism."

Christian System, pp. 101-2.

Campbellism and Romanism are twin sisters. These systems have one common aim, namely, to procure salvation at the least possible cost. They differ greatly in non-essentials, but their fundamental doctrines are identically the same. Peter was the first Pope of the Church of Rome, and he is also claimed to be the great head of the Campbellite Church. To him, according to this system, were delivered the keys of the kingdom, and by him were the doors opened and its constitution laid down. Mr. Campbell says: "With Peter we began our proof of this position, and with Peter we shall end our proof of it. He first proclaimed reformation for the remission of sins; and in his last and farewell letters to the Christian communities he reminds them of that puri-

fication from sin, received in and through immersion."* They both assume that they are commanded to go and remit sins, and quote the same texts to prove their position. And they both claim to remit sins by water baptism, the only difference is that the one continues to exercise this function after baptism, while the other does not go beyond this rite.

Rome teaches that baptism is a necessary condition to salvation, that sins are pardoned by the act performed, and that the consequents of baptism are pardon, regeneration, adoption, and a character that can never be effaced from the soul. And these are the great central doctrines of Campbellism. The Catholic Church holds that her interpretations of the sacred Scriptures are infallible, and, at least by implication, the Campbellite Church makes the same claim for her deductions from the New Testament. While they profess to proclaim the "ancient gospel" and make great assumptions to be the leaders in a movement to emancipate dogma-manacled Christendom from the thralldom of creeds, these pseudo reformers have in reality gone back to the exploded theories of Romanism and the darkness of the Middle Ages.

The following articles of religion are based upon the teachings and practical workings of this system of faith, and are compiled chiefly from the writings

*Christian System, p. 219.

of Alexander Campbell. And it is our candid opinion that all the speculations of Mr. Campbell, combined with a very small portion of the teachings of the gospel, make the compound called Campbellism.

I. GOD.

God appears in the threefold attitude of Creator, Lawgiver, and Redeemer. He reveals his excellencies as Creator, in his wisdom, power, and goodness; as Lawgiver in his justice, truth, and holiness; as Redeemer, in his mercy, condescension, and love. In each and all of which departments he is infinite, immutable, and eternal. The Divine Nature while it is essentially and necessarily singular, it is plural in its personal manifestations. Hence we have the Father, Son and Spirit equally divine though personally distinct from each other.

II. THE SON OF GOD.

The phrase, "Son of God," denotes a temporal relation, but the phrase "Word of God" denotes an eternal unoriginated relation. There was a Word of God from all eternity, but the Son of God began to be in the days of Augustus Cæsar. The Word incarnate is the person called our Lord and Redeemer, Jesus Christ; and while in the system of grace the Father is the one God, in all the supremacy of his glory, Jesus is the one Lord, in all the divine fullness of sovereign, supreme, and universal authority.

III. THE SPIRIT OF GOD.

We can not separate the Spirit and Word of God, and ascribe so much power to the one and so much to the other, for whatever the Word does the Spirit does, and whatever the Spirit does the Word does. We neither believe nor teach abstract Word nor abstract Spirit, but Word and Spirit, Spirit and Word. All the influence of the Spirit now felt in conviction and consolation in the world, is by the Word, written, read, and heard.

IV. THE WORD OF GOD.

The Bible is a full and perfect revelation of God and His will. The Old Testament has been superseded by the New Testament, and it is now of no more importance than any other historical work. But as a means of our salvation we place the gospel of Christ as next in order, as it is in importance, to his sacrifice. The New Testament is to us now in the stead of the personal presence of the Lord and his Apostles. It contains facts to be believed, commandments to be obeyed, and promises to be received. And it has three divisions, the Gospels, or books of convictions, the Acts of the Apostles, or book of conversions, and the Epistles, or books of guidance and consolation to the Church.

V. THE SIN OF MAN'S NATURE.

There is a sin of nature as well as personal transgression, for our nature was corrupted by the fall of

Adam before it was transmitted to us. The effects of the fall, however, were not such as to render man powerless to do good, on the contrary he can of his own strength turn from evil and perform good works, pleasant and acceptable unto God, by which he obtains the remission of his sins.

VI. FAITH.

No testimony, no faith; for faith is the belief of testimony. Where testimony begins, faith begins; and where testimony ends, faith ends. The quality, or nature of faith, is found in the quality or value of the testimony. If the testimony be valid and authoritative, our faith is strong and operative. There is no other manner of believing a fact than as receiving it as true. If it is not received as true it is not believed, and when it is believed it is no more than regarded as true. The efficacy of faith is always in the fact believed, and not in the nature of the faith.

VII. REPENTANCE.

Repentance is one of the natural effects of faith, and not its cause. In the current acceptation of the term, it means sorrow for sin, but not godly sorrow; for this is not to be expected from unconverted and ungodly persons. Christians, when they err, may repent with a godly sorrow, but it is impossible for the unregenerate to do so. Genuine repentance in the alien sinner is nothing more nor less than the reformation of the life.

VIII. THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

The true Christian Church is composed of all of those that have publicly acknowledged Jesus Christ to be the Son of God, and have been immersed for the remission of their sins, and associate under the constitution which the Messiah himself has granted and authorized in the New Testament, and are walking in his ordinances and commandments—and of none else.

IX. BAPTISM.

There are three things to be considered in baptism. The action commanded to be done, the subject specified, and the purpose of the action. The action commanded to be done is immersion, and not sprinkling or pouring. The proper subjects of this ordinance are penitent believers. And the design of baptism is to introduce the subjects of it into the participation of the blessings of the death and resurrection of Christ.

X. THE LORD'S SUPPER.

We maintain that the ordinances of the gospel should be observed as they were in the days of the apostles. Hence we observe this institution by breaking the one loaf on every Lord's day, to which, it is our practice, neither to invite nor debar. We say it is the Lord's Supper for all the Lord's children.

XI. THE REMISSION OF SIN.

The conversion of the sinner is a progressive work.

It is not accomplished by one single act, but by a succession of acts, in their proper order, and each having its proper position and design. These acts are hearing the Word, believing the Word, repentance, confession and immersion. We place immersion last not because we regard it as most important, but because God's law places it there. We regard it as the last condition, the crowning act of man's restoration to God's favor, which he performs for himself. Immersion is for the remission of sins, not for the remission of original sin, or sins yet to be committed, but for the remission of sins that are passed.

XII. THE NEW BIRTH.

When the new birth is spoken of, then the water is introduced, for the Spirit calls nothing personal regeneration except the act of immersion. Persons are begotten by the Spirit, impregnated by the Word, and born of the water. Regeneration is taught to be equivalent to being born again, and is the same import with the new birth. If immersion is equivalent to regeneration, and regeneration is of the same import with being born again, then being born again and immersion are the same thing; for the plain reason, that things that are equal to the same thing are equal to one another.

XIII. THE CONSEQUENTS OF IMMERSION.

We are enlightened, quickened, regenerated, justified, adopted, sanctified and saved by the truth

believed and obeyed, or by faith and immersion. Hence as consequents of our immersion we are born into the divine family, enrolled in heaven, justified or pardoned, and separated or sanctified to God.

XIV. THE ALIEN SINNER.

Every unimmersed person is an alien to the Kingdom of Heaven. The Scripture nowhere commands him to pray, and it is a greivous sin for him to do so; for Christ is not the advocate of the alien. It is only through immersion that he can be brought into the Kingdom, have access to the blood of Christ, and enjoy the blessings of salvation.

XV. THE CITIZEN OF THE KINGDOM.

All immersed believers are free and full citizens of the Kingdom of Heaven, according to its constitution, and are entitled to of all its social privileges and honor. Though they may fall away and become vile and sinful, yet by virtue of their immersion they are still in the Kingdom, and may at any time obtain the forgiveness of their sins by repentance and prayer.

CHAPTER IV.

BAPTISMAL REMISSION—NOT COMMANDED.

“He commanded faith, repentance and baptism to be preached in his name for the remission of sins to every nation under heaven. . . Under the government of the Lord Jesus there is an institution for the forgiveness of sins, like which there was no institution since the world began. . . ‘By the commandment of the everlasting God the gospel is made known to all nations for the *obedience of faith*.’ ‘A great company of the priests became obedient to the faith.’ ‘But they have not all obeyed the gospel;’ and ‘What shall be the end of them who *obey not the gospel*?’ From these sayings it is unquestionably plain that either the gospel itself, taken as a whole, is a command, or that in it there is a command through the obedience of which salvation is enjoyed.”

Christian System, pp. 72, 180, 192.

The conditions of salvation under the old covenant may all be summed up into this one brief sentence. Do and live. But the requisites of salvation under the new covenant are just the reverse of this, and may be stated thus, Live first, then do. It is now no longer necessary to observe either the positive institutions of the Mosaic law or any similar form or ceremony based on them, in order to obtain the forgiveness of sins. The sinner must first seek the pardon of his sins, and, when he has obtained forgiveness he is then under obligation to submit to the ordinances of the Church and to discharge the practical duties of the Christian life. It is remarkably

strange that, notwithstanding the fact that those who lived under the law were not able to meet its requirements, and in the face of the unmistakable teachings of the New Testament, any one would devise a system of faith in which the rite of baptism was made a necessary condition to salvation. Nevertheless, Campbell and his followers have proclaimed to the world that the remission of sins can not be obtained except by the observance of this so-called positive institution. The only difference there is between the doctrine of forgiveness, as taught by the Levitical law and by Campbellism, is that under the one there were many commandments and many ceremonies, while under the other there is but one commandment and one positive institution. This system is appropriately called the "ancient gospel," for it dates back 1,500 years before Christ.

The assumption that the Lord Jesus ever gave water baptism as a command, or ever instituted it in his Church as an ordinance, by obedience to which the sinner can procure the pardon of his sins, is not supported by a single "thus saith the Lord," and is manifestly contrary to the whole tenor of the Scriptures. Christ never commanded any individual to be baptized, either for the remission of sins or otherwise. He never referred to baptism as having any such a signification. He never in person administered baptism with water; never rebuked any one for hav-

ing neglected to receive this rite; never represented the refusal to submit to this ordinance as involving the soul in any danger; never authorized anybody else to threaten condemnation on the neglecter or rejector of water baptism. But while he was on earth people had their sins forgiven without water baptism by the express command, and by the very mouth of the Saviour himself. This was never done, however, without the exercise of faith on the part of the persons whose sins he pardoned. "When he saw their faith," he said to the paralytic: "Man, thy sins are forgiven." And to the sinful woman, he said: "Thy sins are forgiven. . . Thy faith hath saved thee." The claim that there is no promise given to the sinner without water baptism is entirely without divine authority. Christ promised no special blessing to persons who should receive this rite. He used no language that might leave the impression that baptism had, or ever would have ought to do as a condition of forgiveness. He nowhere taught or ever hinted even, that baptism was or ever would be for the remission of sins.

The main text that is relied upon to prove that Christ gave baptism as a command, by obedience to which sins are remitted, is found in the commission to the apostles as recorded in Mark xvi, 16-17: "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be

saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned.” The doctrine of Campbellism is he that is not immersed shall be damned; but there is nothing of this kind taught in this text. If we were to admit that this passage has reference to water baptism, it would not prove that it is for the remission of sins. It declares that damnation is the result of unbelief. “He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not”—not he that is not baptized—“shall be damned.” If on the one hand, the proposition is true, that “he that believeth not shall be damned,” on the other hand, it must be equally true that he that believeth shall not be damned. And therefore the teaching of the text is in perfect harmony with the language of Christ when he says: “He that believeth on him is not condemned; but he that believeth not is condemned already.” The question then, assumes this form, Can men believe before they are baptized? Now, if they can exercise faith prior to baptism, which is most certainly true, then they can escape damnation; that is, be saved without being baptized.

This passage of Scripture, however, has no reference to water baptism, for the language in the original precludes any such interpretation.

“*Ho pisteusas kai baptistheis sothesetai.*” Here the word *pisteusas*, believeth, is the first aorist participle of the active voice, and the *baptistheis* baptized,

is the first aorist participle of the passive voice. Now, whenever the first aorist participle active is followed by the first aorist participle passive the latter is always the immediate resultant of the former; and if the first aorist participle active expresses an internal act, the first aorist participle passive denotes the internal result of that act. In the present case, the faith is an internal act, therefore the baptism must be the internal result of the faith, independent of any external act. All the difficulty in the interpretation of this text has arisen from the attempt to make it mean water baptism. If it be read with the understanding that the baptism of the Holy Spirit is meant, the difficulties all disappear.

But if this passage taught all that the disciples of Campbell claim for it, it would still be an unsafe text upon which to found a doctrine. For the section of Mark in which it appears is regarded as an interpolation. It is neither found in the oldest manuscripts, nor recognized as genuine by the Church Fathers. And besides this it contains at least seventeen words that are used nowhere else in this book. The evidence is very strong that it has been added by some later hand.

Christian baptism was not instituted by the great commission any more than the preaching of the gospel. Christ instituted his baptism, not at the close, but at the beginning of his personal ministry. His

disciples began to administer this rite from the very time they entered the apostolic office. For we read : "After these things came Jesus and his disciples into the land of Judæa; and there he tarried with them, and baptized." (Jno. iii, 22.) Again we read : "When therefore the Lord knew how the Pharisees had heard that Jesus baptized more disciples than John, (though Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples,) He left Judæa, and departed again into Galilee." (Jno. iv, 1-3.) It is evident, from these passages, that the apostles practiced this rite under the personal supervision of the Lord himself, contemporary with the baptism of John; and not for the first time on the day of Pentecost. They were sent forth at first to proclaim the gospel to their own people, and to baptize those that accepted Jesus as the promised Messiah. But by the final commission, given to them by the Saviour, just before his ascension, their field of labor was extended until it embraced all nations. They were to preach the same gospel they had been preaching, and to baptize with the same baptism they had been administering. He never taught them that baptism was for the remission of sins; therefore he did not command them to teach this doctrine.

To reason that because Christ commissioned his disciples to go and proclaim the glad tidings of salvation to all nations, and baptize their converts in

the name of the Holy Trinity, therefore he commanded baptism to be preached for the remission of sins, is an unsound conclusion. The language of the commission does not warrant the teaching of any such a doctrine. Indeed, it does not authorize the preaching baptism at all. This is certainly the case unless it can be proven that Paul received a different commission from the other apostles. For he does not recognize the fact that he was sent to baptize, but declares that it is of far greater importance to preach the gospel. He puts in striking antithesis the preaching of the gospel and baptizing, saying, "I thank God that I baptized none of you, but Crispus and Gaius . . . And I baptized also the household of Stephanus: besides, I know not whether I baptized any other. For Christ sent me not to baptize but to preach the gospel." (I Cor. i, 14, 16, 17.) This language is unintelligible if the great apostle of the Gentiles had himself been baptized for the forgiveness of his sins, and all that had been converted under his preaching had been saved in the same manner. If this doctrine of Campbellism is true, the most important part had been left out of his commission. It is remarkable, if water baptism was essential to salvation, that he was not sent to preach that doctrine. If this theory be true he could not have been properly qualified for his great life work as missionary to the Gentiles. He was the

first gospel preacher to thousands, and was more abundant in labors than all the other apostles; but, according to this theory, he only converted a few persons. He either had no cause to boast of his achievements above the other apostles, or else the doctrine of baptismal remission was no part of the "ancient gospel."

It shows to what extremity Mr. Campbell is put to sustain his position when he argues that because the words obey, obedient, and obedience are used in the gospel that it, as a whole, is a command, or there is in it somewhere a command by the observance of which a person may receive the pardon of his sins. There is no "thus saith the Lord" for any such precept, and those who teach that the Saviour ever gave baptism as a commandment by obedience to which sins can be remitted, are "teaching for doctrines the commandments of men."

Why is it then that in the absence of any direct command from Christ for any one to be baptized, that this rite is retained in the Church? If there were no more grounds for water baptism than is found in the commission of the apostles, it could not be maintained, for it might be understood to mean spiritual baptism. We know, however, that they did baptize those they received into the Church with water, therefore they undoubtedly understood the Saviour to mean water baptism. And those who

are sent to preach the gospel now cannot fulfil their commission unless those who accept Christ will submit to this rite; hence it becomes the duty of the people to observe this institution. It is not a moral duty to observe it, but simply a positive duty. "Moral duties arise out of the nature of the case itself prior to external command. Positive duties do not arise out of the nature of the case, but from external command; nor would they be duties at all were it not for such command received from Him whose creatures and subjects we are." * The apostles and their successors have received a command to administer this rite to all their converts, and because of this external command to them—not because there is any direct command to the individual himself—it becomes the positive duty of every follower of Christ to be baptized.

Water baptism is a divinely instituted rite, and bears the same relation to the visible Church that the baptism of the Holy Spirit does to the invisible Church. It is the door of entrance into the Church by which the privileges of membership and the immunities of the Church are procured. The privileges it bestows are all external, and, though essential to church membership, it is not necessary in order to obtain the forgiveness of sins. It is the outward sign of the inward work that has taken place in

*Butler's Analogy, p. 206.

spiritual baptism. The Church was given this ordinance as a mark of distinction to separate her members from the world, and for this reason it is necessary in order to exhibit our faith to others.

Baptism is nothing more than one of the accidents of the Christian religion. It became a symbol because something had been brought into existence to be symbolized. It can not cleanse the soul from sin, but, when this has been done by spiritual baptism, the outward sign of this work of grace naturally follows. It is simply the external badge of discipleship in the Church. There is a close resemblance between this rite in the Church and the badge of a secret society. The badge was adopted by the order because it fitly represents the principles that brought it into existence, or the purpose for which the society was organized; and, when worn by its members, it is the outward sign that they have espoused these principles, and are in possession of all it signifies. How foolish it would be for an uninitiated person to pin on the badge of one of these secret societies, and imagine that it made him a member and bestowed upon him the rights and privileges of the order. But it is no less absurd for a person to put on baptism, the badge of Christianity, and imagine that it makes him a Christian. Unless he has first been washed from his sins by the baptism of the Holy Spirit, the whole thing is a farce. If he does

not possess the thing signified, the sign is an empty form, a mere mockery.

The followers of Campbell teach that John the Baptist prepared the way for the coming Messiah by establishing water baptism as the positive institution for the forgiveness of sins. They are so deficient in wisdom that they fail to see that this overthrows the theory upon which their whole system is founded. But Mr. Campbell, himself, was wise enough to see that this was in conflict with his theory, that the kingdom of heaven was not set up until Pentecost; therefore he interprets everything as figurative that is said of entering the kingdom previous to this day. There is no evidence that the Baptist ever instituted water baptism, or that he taught that it was for the remission of sins. "John did baptize in the wilderness and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins." (Mark i, 4.) John himself says: "I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance." (Matt. iii, 11.) These teachers represent him as preaching throughout the land the baptism of water for the remission of sins. But the Scriptures do not justify them in teaching anything of the kind. It is declared that he preached the baptism of repentance which was for the forgiveness of sins, or baptizes the soul from sin. There is no passage that directly connects his baptism with the pardon of sins. It is plainly stated that it was *eis*,

for, to, in order to, the repentance, which was *eis*, to, in order to, for, the remission of sins. The baptism was for the repentance, and the repentance was for the forgiveness of sins. And this was not without faith, for Paul says: "John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus." (Acts xix, 4.) The assumption that, under the dispensation of John, water baptism was instituted for the remission of sin is wholly gratuitous, and can not be successfully maintained.

If water baptism is a condition of remission of sins, then it is either a repeatable affair, or else it is an act by which the sinner's calling and election is forever made sure. Man is prone to wander from God, and it is not an uncommon thing for the Christian to commit sin. But how do they obtain forgiveness for these sins committed after conversion? Just as they did those before conversion, for the Scriptures reveal only one way by which sins can be remitted. Nowhere in all the Word of God are sinners divided into two classes, aliens and citizens, and two separate and distinct ways provided by which the members of each class can obtain pardon. The sinner is a sinner in the sight of God, no matter whether he is in the Church or out of it. "When a righteous man doth turn from his righteousness, and commit

iniquity . . . he shall die in his sin, and his righteousness which he hath done shall not be remembered." (Ezek. iii, 20.) Now, if baptism is a righteous act, then, when a man falls into sin his baptism is no longer remembered; therefore, he is no better off than the one who has never submitted to this rite. And if he desires to have his sins forgiven again, he must of necessity be rebaptized. And if he would avoid the possibility of eternal death, he must be baptized whenever he falls into sin. These teachers will not rebaptize, and, therefore, according to their own theory, it is impossible to have sins forgiven that are committed after baptism. It is certain that baptism is not a repeatable affair, and it is not impossible for sins to be remitted which are committed after baptism; hence it can not be a necessary condition to the remission of sins. This one fact that this doctrine makes baptism a repeatable affair is sufficient of itself to overthrow this system of faith.

In order to avoid this difficulty, the advocates of Campbellism teach that there are two distinct ways by which sins are forgiven. The alien sinner must be immersed for the remission of his sins, but the naturalized citizen can have his sins pardoned through repentance and the prayer of faith. And this involves them in the further absurdity of teaching that Christ is not the advocate of the alien sin-

ner, and that it is a sin for him to pray before he is immersed. The writer has heard some of them try to prove their position by representing Egypt as the world, the crossing of the Red Sea as immersion, the journey in the wilderness as the Church, and Canaan as heaven. Then they reason that because the serpent was lifted up in the wilderness by Moses that the Israelites who had been bitten by the fiery serpents might be healed; therefore Christ was lifted up in the Church, in order that those of her members that are beguiled into sin, by the old serpent, might be forgiven their sins. This is so absurd that it only needs to be stated to refute it. The Saviour was lifted upon the cross that "whosoever believeth in him might not perish, but have eternal life." They seek to avoid the force of all such passages as the following: "If any man sin we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ, the righteous," by saying that they are found in the epistles. And these, they claim, have not a single word that has reference to the alien. The "we" in this text, it is affirmed, limits it to the Church. And by this same method of reasoning we can prove that the apostles were in the habit of using profane language, for James, when speaking of the tongue, says: "Therewith curse we men." In both these passages the apostles are speaking for mankind. Nothing but the demands of a false doc-

trine could have ever led to such arbitrary interpretations of the Scriptures, and to so many absurdities. This doctrine is manifestly contrary to reason, but its advocates seem determined to maintain it, whatever violence of interpretation or misrepresentation of the Word of God may be required.



CHAPTER V.

BAPTISMAL REMISSION—NOT SCRIPTURAL.

“Peter, on Pentecost, exhorted the Jews to *save themselves* from that untoward generation, by reforming and being immersed for the remission of their sins, in the name of the Lord Jesus. Immersion *alone* was the act of turning to God. Hence, in the commission to convert the nations, the only institution mentioned after proclaiming the gospel was the immersion of the believers, as the divinely-authorized way of carrying out and completing the work. And from the day of Pentecost to the final *Amen* in the revelation of Jesus Christ, no person was said to be converted, or to turn to God, until he was buried in and raised up out of the water.”

Christian System, pp. 185, 209.

The advocates of Campbellism, in setting forth their peculiar doctrinal views, claim to find a “thus saith the Lord” for every tenet of their creed. And it is not surprising that they are able to do this, when we consider the manner in which they interpret the Word of God. With them it always means just what it literally says it means. The Bible is the only legitimate source of ultimate appeal in all controverted subjects of religion, but it will not always do to apply to its language this arbitrary rule of interpretation. A slavish literalism is the bane of reason, and often stands as a bar to the comprehension of the meaning of the Scriptures. The real question, in the study of passages that contain misleading terms or phraseology, is not so much

what is said as what is meant. Take, for example, expressions like the following: "Judah is a lion's whelp." "Let the dead bury their dead," and "The seven candlesticks which thou sawest are the seven churches." Passages like these are common, and the reader of any degree of intelligence will readily perceive that they are not to be understood in their literal sense. And this is equally true of not a few of the texts, that are relied upon by these teachers to support their doctrines.

The language on which they chiefly base the doctrine of baptismal remission is Acts ii, 3-8: "Repent and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." This is the only passage in the whole Bible that seems to teach clearly that baptism is for the remission of sins. There are a number of other texts that are adduced to prove this theory, but it is only by implication that they render it any support. If this doctrine is true there should be more than one text in which it is plainly set forth. The book of divine revelation is not an aggregation of independent atoms, but a coherent whole. It may be accepted or rejected, but you can not pick and choose, and take as much or as little as you like. You may take here and there an isolated passage and prove by the Scriptures that the most heretical doctrine is true. In-

spired men wrote whole books, and preached entire sermons without once referring to water baptism. It is reasonable to suppose that if baptism were to have been the condition of forgiveness under the gospel dispensation, that some of the prophets would have foreseen this fact. In all of their references to the great spiritual awakening to follow the incarnation of the Son of God, faith, and not baptism, is revealed as the condition of remission. There is scarcely a chapter in the New Testament where faith is not connected with remission of sins, while baptism is never mentioned as having any such a design, except in this one instance. Great stress, however, is placed upon the circumstances under which these words were spoken. According to the advocates of baptismal remission, the keys of the kingdom were delivered to Peter, and, he, acting under the express mandate of the king, opened on Pentecost, for the first time, the door through which mankind must enter or be forever excluded from the kingdom. They claim that he, on this day, laid down the law of induction into the kingdom for all subsequent ages, by declaring the saving efficacy of water baptism. As this text, according to their theory, stands at the threshold of the gospel dispensation, and is a part of the "constitution of the kingdom;" therefore they contend it is entitled to more than ordinary signification.

A critical examination of this language will show that it gives no support to this doctrine. The word *christos* in this passage, which is anglicized, not translated, Christ, means anointed. Its use was originally derived from the ceremony of anointing the priests and kings, when they were inducted into the functions of their offices. And finally the word came to be used by the prophets to designate the promised Messiah, under the appellation of God's Anointed. It was always used by the Jews as an appellative and never as a proper name. In the original language the article is almost always employed in connection with this word; but the translators have so seldom rendered the article with it, that the word is commonly understood to be a proper or surname of the Saviour, instead of an appellative or name of office. It is true that after many years, by the frequent association of this term with only one individual, that it began to be used as a part of the name of the Lord. This was hastened by the fact that this name had never been used as such, while the name Jesus was common among the Jews. The word at the beginning was as much of an appellative as the word Baptist used in connection with the name John. And the one was as regularly accompanied by the article as the other. After a careful personal examination of Luke's writings it has been found that the article accompanies *christos* in every

instance except three. And there must have been some good reason for leaving it out in these passages. And the word in these texts, where the article does not accompany it, should be translated with its ordinary meaning instead of being transcribed, as it is where the article is joined to it. The failure to do this obscures the true meaning of the Scriptures, and an erroneous doctrine is sometimes the result of such a mistranslation. The passage under consideration is a case in point. The article does not accompany *christos*, and therefore it should have been translated with its common signification. By ignoring the fact that the article was not used here, and anglicizing the word, instead of translating it, has led to the teaching of the erroneous doctrine of baptismal remission. The purpose of Peter was to impress upon the minds of the people that salvation was to be obtained in the name of Jesus, whom God had anointed for the remission of sins. It does not matter what meaning this word acquired afterwards, it could not in this text mean more than anointed. It is not at all probable that at this early date the apostles distinguished Jesus by the name of Christ. They had only recognized the fact that he was the Messiah a short time, and if Peter had intended to speak of his Messiahship, he undoubtedly would have used the article with this word.

The fact that an elliptical form of speech was

common among the Jews, throws further light on this text. They were familiar with the teachings of the Scriptures, and it was not necessary to speak of that which they would naturally supply themselves. There is an ellipsis in this passage that must be supplied before those not accustomed to this mode of speaking can fully understand its meaning. In the phrase "in the name of Jesus" the preposition *epi*, on, upon, is used, and not *eis*, in, into. And *epi to onomati* here does not mean the same as *eis to onoma* in the commission. The one means upon the name, that is, upon faith in the name, while the other can not mean more than by the authority of, or at most into a profession of the name. Whenever *epi* is used in connection with the name of Jesus, faith is either expressed or understood as the condition of the blessings bestowed. There is an exact parallel of this phrase in Peter's account of the conversion of Cornelius and his family: "For as much then as God gave them the like gift as he did unto us, who believed on (*epi*) the Lord Jesus Christ." (Acts xi, 17.) If this text is properly translated, and the ellipsis supplied it will read: "Repent and be baptized every one of you, believing on the name of Jesus, anointed for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." And instead of the doctrine of baptismal remission being taught by Peter on this occa-

sion, his language is in perfect harmony with the whole tenor of the Scriptures.

But aside from the proper rendering of this text, the theory of remission of sins by water baptism, is easily overthrown by the simplest rule of interpretation, that obscure texts are to be interpreted by plain ones. The discourse of Peter was based upon his quotation from Joel, in which the prophet foretells the great outpouring of the Holy Spirit under the gospel dispensation. The condition of salvation foreseen by the prophet is given in the twenty-first verse of this chapter: "And it shall come to pass, that whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved." The efficacy of prayer is placed above that of water. And it is not likely that after he had told the people that this was the time to which this prophecy referred, when salvation should be obtained by calling upon the Lord, he would immediately contradict the prophet by telling them that baptism was the condition of procuring this blessing. The apostle approved the requirement of remission given by Joel, and it is not reasonable to suppose that in the next breath he would teach that baptism was the condition, and not faith exercised through prayer.

The sermon of this apostle to the multitude that came together after he had healed the lame man, contains no reference to baptism. He exhorts

the people after this manner: "Repent ye, therefore, and be converted that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord." (Acts iii, 19.) When he was brought before the Sanhedren to answer for preaching this sermon, he mentions repentance and remission of sins, but says nothing about baptism. And the reason there is no allusion to baptism is that it has nothing whatever to do with the forgiveness of sins. It is not possible that he would make it a condition of forgiveness in his first sermon, and in the second preach a different doctrine. Mr. Campbell attempts to destroy the force of this passage by saying that immersion and conversion are convertible terms, meaning one and the same thing. But this can not be the case if his position is true, that immersion is always a passive act. The word *epistrepsate*, be converted, is in the active voice, and literally means turn again; therefore it can not be equivalent of the passive, be immersed. Thousands entered into the enjoyment of forgiveness of sins at this time upon the exercise of faith without hearing water mentioned. For we read: "How be it many which heard the word believed and the number of the men was about five thousand." (Acts iv, 4.)

The falsity of this doctrine is positively proven from the case of Simon the sorcerer. He believed

and was baptized, yet he still remained in the "gaul of bitterness and in the bond of iniquity." And as soon as Peter saw that Simon was still in his sins, he exhorts him to repent of his wickedness and pray to God for forgiveness. Now, if baptism was for the remission of sins, why did he not re-baptize him? The Sorcerer requested the apostle to pray for him, but according to this system he should have asked him to baptize him again. To reply that he was a naturalized citizen is simply begging the question, and is only an attempt to avoid the difficulty in which the theory of a positive institution for the remission of sins involves them.

The most difficult passage for these teachers to harmonize with their system is the account of the conversion of Cornelius and his household. The man, to whom the keys of the kingdom had been given, was sent to open the door, that the Gentiles might also enter into the kingdom and enjoy its blessings and privileges. These people have not been familiar with the Scriptures from their infancy as the Jews had been, and it will be necessary for the apostle to be more explicit in his statements than when speaking to his own people. And hence he gives the condition of salvation in such plain language that even an ignorant Gentile can not misunderstand his meaning. He says: "To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name

whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." (Acts x, 43.)

Immediately upon the utterance of these words they all believed, and received the pardon of their sins through the baptism of the Holy Spirit. Prior to this time not a word had been said of water baptism. And how it could be a condition of remission and not be administered until after these persons' sins had been forgiven, is more than any one can satisfactorily explain. There is not a text in the whole Bible that says, "Through his name whosoever" is baptized "shall receive remission of sins." Faith was announced as the condition of forgiveness, while baptism was not referred to until after they were saved from their sins. At the conference held in Jerusalem to consider some questions with regard to the Gentile converts, the testimony of this apostle shows conclusively that these persons were saved by faith: "Peter rose up and said unto them, men and brethren, ye know how that a good while ago God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel and believe; and God, which knoweth the hearts, bear them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost even as he did unto us; and put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith." (Acts xv, 7-9.) He seems to have expected that there would be something required of them, such as cir-

cumcision, before they could enjoy the blessings of the gospel, but they were not compelled to comply with the forms and ceremonies of the law. The Jewish converts received the pardon of their sins through the exercise of faith, and God put no difference between them and the Gentiles, purifying their hearts also by faith. This proves beyond a doubt that the condition of forgiveness was not baptism, but faith in Jesus Christ.

The language of I Pet., iii, 21, is cited to prove this doctrine: "The like figure whereunto baptism doth now save us (not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God) by the resurrection of Christ." This passage is one of the most difficult of interpretation, and for this reason it can be more readily used to support the doctrine of baptismal remission. Peter affirms that it does not put away the filth of the flesh—that is, the sins—but answers a good conscience. It does not procure the good conscience, but answers a conscience that has already been made good in some way by the resurrection of Christ. Baptism is not the antitype of the flood, but of the ark. If water is made to represent the medium of salvation, the antediluvians must have been saved, and not Noah and his family. The water was the medium of destruction, and the ark of salvation. The antediluvians were immersed for their destruction and not

for salvation. And these eight persons were saved by faith in the promises of God, which led them to enter the ark. And if the people desire salvation now, they must in like manner keep out of the water and enter the ark, that is, Christ, through the exercise of faith.

The favorite apostle of Campbellism does not teach the doctrine of baptismal remission at all. In numerous places he sets forth faith as the condition of forgiveness, but never baptism. If he had designed to teach this doctrine on Pentecost he surely would have mentioned it as a condition of salvation in some of his other sermons, or, at least, in his writings to the Church. As he does nothing of the kind, we are forced to conclude that he had no such doctrine in mind when he delivered his first discourse.

Next to Peter, the apostle Paul is relied upon to establish the doctrine of baptismal remission. The passage in which he quotes the language of Ananias at his conversion is presented as positive proof that he was baptized in order to wash away his sins. "Why tarriest thou? arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling upon the name of the Lord." (Acts xxii, 16.) The word, *baptisai*, which is translated be baptized, is in the middle voice, and the force of this voice should have been retained in the translation. If we give this word the reflective force of

the middle voice, the text will read, "Why tarriest thou? arise and baptize thyself, and wash away thy sins, calling upon the name of the Lord." This is the only time that this word is used in the middle voice in the gospel, and there is undoubtedly a reason for its use in this instance. It is certain that it precludes the idea of immersion to obtain the remission of sins, for no one can immerse himself. But he could baptize himself with the Holy Spirit by calling upon the Lord through faith. Mr. Campbell himself gives us the rule for interpreting this text. He says: "Jesus said, 'Convert the nations, immersing them into the name,' &c., 'and teach them to observe,' &c. The construction of the sentence fairly indicates that no person can be a disciple, according to the commission who has not been immersed: for the active participle in connection with an imperative either declares the manner in which the imperative shall be obeyed or explains the meaning of the command. To this I have found no exception, for example:—'Cleanse the house, sweeping it.' 'Cleanse the garment, washing it.'" * In the present case we have the active participle "calling" in connection with the imperative "be baptized;" therefore this can not be an exception to this general rule, or it would have been found by the author of this system, for it is one of the principal texts of Campbellism. Therefore, Paul was bap-

* *Christian System*, p. 198.

tized and had his sins washed away by calling upon the Lord. A review of the circumstances of the case makes this obvious. Ananias was sent to him that he might receive his sight and be filled with the Holy Ghost. He came to him and spoke these words, then laid his hands upon his head, and his sins were forgiven, he was baptized with the Holy Spirit, and the scales fell from his eyes all in the same moment. Now, all this took place before he was baptized with water. And how water baptism could have anything to do with his conversion is more than any one can tell.

Campbell shows what an adept he is at sophistry in the adroit manner in which he attempts to harmonize the message of Paul to the Philippian jailer, with that of Peter to the Pentecostians. He asks: "How is this, Paul, do you preach another gospel to the Gentiles than Peter preached to the Jews? . . . Paul replies, 'Strike, but hear me. Had I been in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost, I would have spoken as Peter did. Peter spoke to believing and penitent Jews; I spoke to an ignorant Roman jailer. I arrested his attention after the earthquake by simply announcing that there was salvation to him and his family through belief in Christ.' But why did you not mention repentance, baptism, the Holy Spirit?' 'Who told you I did not?' Luke says nothing about it; and I concluded you said nothing about them.

Luke was a faithful historian was he not? 'Yes, very faithful; and why did you not faithfully hearken to his account? Does he not immediately subjoin that as soon as I got the jailer's ear, I spoke the word of the Lord to him, and all that were in his house?' . . . I spoke the whole gospel . . . I mentioned repentance, baptism, remission, the Holy Spirit, the resurrection, judgment, and eternal life.' "* What Campbell says of the faith and penitence of the Jews, and the ignorance of the jailer is true; hence it was not necessary for Peter to state definitely the condition of pardon, while it was necessary for Paul to mention faith in the most direct and impressive manner. But it is the sheerest nonsense to intimate that it was necessary to attract the jailer's attention. He had been brought face to face with death, and saw his lost and ruined condition. And his greatest desire was to obtain salvation; therefore he rushes to these men, who teach the way of life, and cries: "Sirs, what must I do to be saved?" There was no necessity to attract his attention, for never was there a sinner that had a deeper realization of his need of divine aid, or that was more aroused to a sense of his lost condition than this man. And the apostles did not wait until they got him off into some secluded corner of the prison to explain to him the plan of salvation. He had already repented, and they told him at once: "Believe

* *Christian System*, p. 249.

on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved." And if he obeyed them he was saved before there was any mention made of baptism. If Baptism was for the remission of sins they should have told him to be baptized and he should be saved. The reason they did not was because it had nothing to do as a condition of salvation.

No one believing the doctrine of baptismal remission would have ever made such an answer as this. And if the founder of this system had labored as hard to reconcile Peter with Paul as he has Paul with Peter, he would have discovered the true condition of salvation was faith, and not water baptism.

When Paul came to Ephesus, he found twelve persons, who are called disciples, though they had not been baptized with Christian baptism. In receiving John's baptism, according to this system, they had believed and been baptized for the remission of their sins. And the Apostle baptized them again, hence if John's baptism and Christian baptism were both designed for the remission of sins, these persons were baptized twice for the same purpose. But this second baptism was administered without any evidence that they had fallen into sin. And if John's baptism was for the forgiveness of sins, Christian baptism is not for that purpose. These persons had no sins to remit, and they received no inward spiritual benefit by being re-baptized; for they did

not receive the Holy Ghost until the apostle had laid his hands upon them.

Another favorite passage offered in proof of this doctrine is Romans vi, 17: "But God be thanked, ye were the servants of sin, but ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you." In presenting this as a proof text the question is asked, "What is the doctrine of which the apostle is speaking?" And the answer invariably is, "The death, burial and resurrection of Christ." They then inquire what the form of this doctrine is; and answer immersion, or a figurative death, burial and resurrection in the water. Paul, they then claim, had reference to the baptism of the Romans for the remission of their sins. He was not speaking of water baptism in this chapter, but of the baptism of the Holy Spirit, by which they had been caused to die unto sin, and had been raised into a newness of life. These teachers always quote this passage as if it read: "You have obeyed from the heart the form of the doctrine," instead of "that form of doctrine." These Roman converts had not obeyed the form of the doctrine, but "that form of doctrine" itself. There is a vast difference between the form of the doctrine, and "that form of doctrine." The form of a house is not a house. The form of a man is not a man. If a person in speaking of a cottage-house says that John Smith has that form of

house, we would understand him to mean that Mr. Smith owned a cottage-house. But if it was said of him that he had the form of that kind of house, we would not think he owned a house at all, but that he had the architectural plan, or a photograph of a house of that description. If it were published that the Smithsonian Institute had in its museum the form of an Esquimau, the people would naturally suppose that it was a skeleton; but if the announcement read, that form of man called Esquimau, they would take it that there was a real man there, and not his form. Baptism does not symbolize doctrine. But if we admit that it is the form of the doctrine, it does not help their cause. These people had not obeyed the form, but had actually died unto sin and been raised into a life of righteousness. They were then dead, crucified and raised into a life of holiness, and no momentary dipping will represent their state. This work of grace had been wrought in them by the baptism of the Holy Spirit. These teachers may choose the form of the doctrine, but we prefer the doctrine itself. If they can be satisfied with the shadow, all right, but we prefer the substance.

We have now examined the chief texts that the advocates of this doctrinal scheme rely upon to sustain their doctrine of baptismal remission, and have found that the doctrine is unscriptural. And the only way that these texts have been made to teach

any such doctrine has been by having a theory to prove, and picking the passages that might be made to aid in maintaining this theory. No one without a theory to prove would ever find any support for this doctrine in the Scriptures.



CHAPTER VI.

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION—ITS IMPOSSIBILITY.

“This second or new birth, which inducts into the Kingdom of God, is always subsequent to a death and burial, as it will be into the everlasting kingdom of glory. It is indeed a literal death and burial before a literal resurrection into the heavenly and eternal kingdom. It is also a metaphorical or figurative death and burial, before the figurative resurrection or new birth into the Kingdom of Heaven. Water is the element in which this burial and resurrection is performed, according to the constitutional laws of the Kingdom of Heaven. Hence, Jesus connects the water and the Spirit when speaking of entering the Kingdom of God . . . Cornelius and his family were as devout and pious as any of you. . . . Yet . . . it was necessary ‘to tell him words by which himself and house might be saved.’ These words were told him: he believed them, and received the Holy Spirit; yet still he must be born again. For a person can not be said to be born again *of anything which he receives*, and still less of miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit. He was immersed, and into the Kingdom of God he came.”

Christian System, pp. 161, 239.

Immersion, according to Campbellism, is a panacea for all the effects of sin, whether inherited from the progenitor of the race, or caused by actual transgression. The water not only has the power to wash away the sins, but it regenerates and sanctifies. In fact, it is boldly asserted that immersion is regeneration, and that regeneration is immersion. And, of course, these teachers claim to base this doctrine upon the teachings of the Bible.

The literal rendering of John iii., 5, is mainly relied upon to prove their theory of baptismal regeneration. It reads: "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of the water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God." It will be necessary, in order to understand the meaning of this text, to enter into an examination of the circumstances under which it was spoken. Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews, came to Jesus by night to inquire concerning his doctrines, and Jesus proclaimed to him this great truth: "Except a man be born again he can not see the kingdom of God." The word *anōthen*, which is rendered "again," has two meanings—from above, and again. Nicodemus takes the latter signification of the word, and therefore fails to comprehend what the Saviour meant; and is led to ask, in astonishment: "How can a man be born when he is old? Can he enter a second time into his mother's womb, and be born?" Christ then explains to him that he was not speaking of a physical, but of a spiritual birth, and illustrates his meaning by a symbol that was familiar to every Jew. He says: "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God." The ruler was well acquainted with the use of water, in the ritual of Judaism, to signify the cleansing influence of the Holy Spirit. And Jesus, in order

to show him that what he meant by being born again did not refer to the physical man, declares that a man must be "born of water and the Spirit."

There was nothing new in thus representing the work of the Spirit under the figure of water, for it was the standing symbol of spiritual cleansing under the law. The Old and New Testaments abound in such passages as the following: "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and you shall be clean: from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you." (Ezek. xxxvi, 25.) The advocates of baptismal regeneration dare not contend that the people to whom this prophecy refers were really cleansed from their moral filthiness and idolatries by being baptized with water; for the mode is sprinkling, and not immersion. The reference in this text to the application of water to the body by sprinkling is undoubtedly emblematic of the purifying of the soul by the Holy Spirit. Again, we read: "In the last day, the great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried, saying, If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink. He that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water. (But this spake he of the Spirit, which they that believe on him should receive: for the Holy Ghost was not yet given, because that Jesus was not yet glorified.)" (Jno. vii, 37-39.) This explicit statement

from the lips of the Son of God himself proves conclusively that water was the recognized symbol of the Holy Spirit.

If "born of water" in this passage means baptism, then Christ must have meant two separate and distinct things by "born of water and the Spirit." Therefore a man cannot enter the kingdom of God without two distinct births, one of water and the other of the Spirit. But he was not talking of two separate and distinct things, but of one and the same thing under the similitude of water. The meaning is as water cleanses, refreshes and purifies the body; so the Holy Spirit cleanses, renews and purifies the soul. Regeneration is a spiritual transformation, and not a mere bodily act. It is the renewing of the soul, and not the washing of the body. And as Nicodemus had failed to comprehend the spiritual nature of the new birth, Christ introduces the water, which was the well known emblem of spiritual cleansing, to illustrate what he meant by being born again.

John the Baptist, in foretelling the special work of the promised Messiah, uses language very similar to that which Christ employed on this occasion. He says: "I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance; but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear: he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and fire."

(Matt. iii, 11.) The word fire certainly does not mean literal fire. And undoubtedly it was not literally fulfilled on the day of Pentecost; for it was not spoken to the disciples, but to the multitude that received John's baptism. The word fire is used figuratively, and represents the effect of the baptism of the Holy Ghost. The reference is to the purifying effect of fire upon the precious metals. As fire purifies and refines the gold, separating from it the dross; so the Holy Spirit shall purify and refine the soul, separating from it the dross of sin. Precisely the same thing is meant here by "the Holy Ghost and fire," that Jesus meant by "water and the Spirit."

It is manifest from the remainder of his discourse, that Jesus did not refer to baptism when he said "born of water." For he reasoned with Nicodemus in a logical manner, illustrating spiritual things by temporal things. He informs the ruler that it would do him no good if he could be born a second time, a natural birth, for: "That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." Jesus refers to the well-known law, that like begets like. Flesh begets flesh, and Spirit begets spirit. And if the phrase "born of water" means baptism, the logical conclusion is, that which is born of water is water. If water can have any effect on the souls of those immersed in it, it must of neces-

sity beget in them its own likeness. Perhaps this may account for the great love these people have for the water.

The trouble with these teachers is that they stop, when they read in this chapter as far as the word water. This discourse continues to the twenty-second verse. It is not reasonable to suppose this learned master in Israel was so dull that he could not understand what immersion was. He was soon led to see by the explanations that Jesus gave that he was speaking of a spiritual birth; and the question naturally arises in his mind: "How can these things be?" And Christ tells him just how they can be, by setting forth, from the fourteenth to the eighteenth verse, explicitly the condition of salvation. "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up; that whosoever believeth in him shall not perish, but have eternal life. For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. . . He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God." Christ should have said, if he designed to teach the doctrine of baptismal regeneration: "As Moses baptized the Israelites in the Red Sea, even so must the Son of man be baptized: That

whosoever is baptized into him should not perish, but have eternal life. For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever is baptized into him should not perish, but have everlasting life. He that is baptized into him is not condemned; but he that hath not been baptized is condemned already, because he hath not been baptized into the name of the only begotten Son of God."

If the phrase "born of water" in this passage is to be taken as proof that Christ taught the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, then, he also taught the doctrine of eucharistic regeneration. For in John vi, 53-54, he says: "Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day." Mark it well, he does not say you have no abiding life, but that you have no life. And if we are to understand by "born of water" that no one can enter the kingdom of God without baptism, we must also understand that the sacrament of the Lord's Supper is a necessary condition to the procurement of spiritual life. And if the language is figurative in the last text, it is also figurative in the former.

Another text that is adduced to support this theory is: "Not by works of righteousness which we have

done, but according to his mercy he saved us by the washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost; which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ." (Titus iii, 5-6.) It seems strange that they should have taken this text to prove this doctrine, for they could not have found one that more positively contradicts it. The distinguishing characteristic of Campbellism is salvation by works. And if baptism is a work of righteousness, as these teachers claim, it has nothing whatever to do with procuring salvation; for the apostle declares that it is not "by works of righteousness which we have done." It is taught by Campbell that immersion and regeneration are the same thing. And if in this place "the washing of regeneration" means immersion, then it involves the absurdity of making the effect the cause, the washing becomes the thing washed; and the cleansing becomes the thing cleansed. The relative "which" indicates that both "the washing of regeneration" and "the renewing of the Holy Ghost" were accomplished by something that was shed upon these people. And if it was shed upon them, it could not have been immersion; hence if "the washing of regeneration" has reference to water baptism, immersion could not have been the mode practiced at that time. Immersion is a work done by man, but here God is said to save us by the regenerating grace shed on us

through faith in Jesus Christ. The "washing" and "renewing" are but parts of the one divine process by which the sins are washed away, and the soul is created anew.

The assumption that, "according to the constitutional laws of the Kingdom of Heaven," immersion inducts into the kingdom of God is wholly gratuitous. Paul expressly declares that this is accomplished by the baptism of the Holy Spirit: "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit." (I. Cor. xii, 13.) He does not say, "for by one water we are all baptized into one body;" but by "one Spirit are we all baptized into one body." The attempt to destroy the force of this text by saying that it is by "the direction of one Spirit we are all baptized into one body" is utterly futile. For if this is the case, then it is by "the direction of one Spirit that we are all made to drink." But what is it we are made to drink by "the direction of one Spirit?" This shows the absurdity of any such an interpretation. No sophistry can evade the force of this text; it stands as an everlasting refutation of the doctrine of salvation by water.

The highest aim of Campbellism is not above the development of the moral nature. The whole tendency of the system is toward that fallacious doc-

trine, that man by his own strength and works can bring himself into harmony with God. In other words, that there is no need of a supernatural work in conversion, but a man by his own efforts can save himself.

Neither the reformation of the life, the observance of the right of baptism, nor the performance of benevolent acts, can make any man a child of God. For the Christian life is not a highly developed form of the natural life. It is not the result of the development of the moral character. The germ of divine life must first be implanted in the soul, before there can be any spiritual life. The farmer who would spend all of his time in cultivating, fertilizing, and irrigating his land might get it in a high state of cultivation; but it would be impossible for him to raise any grain until he had first sown the seed. It is true he can keep down the weeds and make the ground rich and mellow, but he can do nothing more. He may use the best farming implements, the richest fertilizers, and may even deluge the land with water; yet he can not in this way produce one kernel of grain. And so it does not matter how great the reformation of the sinner may be; how many good deeds he may do; how many times he is immersed. These things can not make him a Christian for they can not produce life. He may in this way, it is true, keep down many outward sins, and form a character

of great moral beauty. He may be honest and good, kind and generous, pure and true, but these of themselves can not bring forth life. Before he can have spiritual life the seed of this life must be implanted in the soul. When this has been done he can develop it by cultivation, but cultivation will not generate it.

A man may build up a good moral character by the observance of certain rules based upon the teachings of the Scriptures. He may be able to make himself more and more moral until he reaches a certain limit; but he can not go beyond this limit and make himself godly. For godliness is not a moral character built up around a man, but a life within him. In this point is the difference between the highest development of the moral nature in the natural man, and the Christ life in the Christian. The one, conforms mechanically to the letter of the law, while the other conforms to its spirit. The result in one is the building up of the moral character like an architectural edifice, by adding one detached good work to another. The result in the other is the development of a new life from the birth and growth of a vital energy implanted in the soul. The moral life has its foundations on the earth, and can be built up toward the skies, but it never reaches heaven. The Christ life has its origin in heaven, and descends from thence into the soul. It is a new life

born from above. There is a whole realm of difference between them. By this birth that comes from above, the Christian is brought into the realm of spiritual life, while the one who depends on outward things to save him, after he has done his best, is still left in the realm of spiritual death.

The natural man is spiritually dead, and nothing that he can do of himself can bring him into the enjoyment of spiritual life. This life can not come independent of antecedent life. The natural man being dead in "trespasses and sins" can not raise himself into "newness of life." He is in the realm of spiritual death, and there is an impassable gulf fixed between it and the realm of spiritual life. And the person who would enter this upper or spiritual kingdom, must be born from above. He must be the recipient of something from this realm above him before he can enter it. The declaration of Christ is: "Except a man be born again," born from above, "he can not see the kingdom of God."

The assertion that "a person can not be said to be born again of anything which he receives" is not supported by the facts in the case. If Mr. Campbell had said that a person can be born of that which he receives, and that, too, of the baptism of the Holy Spirit, his statement would have been in keeping with the truth; but as it is, there is not the least shadow of truth in it. This doctrine of baptismal

regeneration is diametrically opposed to all the laws of Biogenesis, which excludes the possibility of the natural man becoming a spiritual man without the intervention of life. According to this science, he must be born from above, and of that which he receives, or he will remain forever in the kingdom of spiritual death.

"The passage from the mineral world to the plant or animal world is hermetically sealed on the mineral side. This inorganic world is staked off from the living world by barriers which have never yet been crossed from within. No change of substance, no modification of environment, no chemistry, no electricity, nor any evolution can endow any single atom of the mineral world with the attribute of life. Only by the bending down into this dead world of some living form can these dead atoms be gifted with the properties of vitality; without this preliminary contact with life they remain fixed in the inorganic sphere forever."* Now, unless the human soul is an exception to all the known laws of life, this is equally true with regard to the natural man entering into the spiritual world. "The passage from the natural world into the spiritual world is hermetically sealed on the natural side. The door from the inorganic to the organic is shut, no mineral can open it; so the door from the natural to the spiritual is shut, and

* Natural Law in the Spiritual World, p. 64.

no man can open it. This world of natural men is staked off from the spiritual world by barriers which have never yet been crossed from within. No organic change, no modification of environment, no mental energy, no moral effort, no evolution of character, no progress of civilization can endow any single soul with the attribute of Spiritual Life.”*

There can not be found on the face of the earth a fountain or stream containing vegetable or animal life, where by dipping into it a handful of soil, it will become a living plant, or by immersing in it a lump of clay, it will be transformed into a living man. But if this doctrine of baptismal regeneration is true, spiritual life is, in some mysterious manner, stored up in rivers, creeks, ponds and baptistries; and is measured out to all that are immersed in them for the purpose of procuring it. Possibly the Spirit which “moved upon the face of the waters” in the beginning has never left them, and all that are immersed in them instantaneously inhale the life-giving Spirit. This must be the case, for Mr. Campbell says: “The soul of the intelligent subject is as fully immersed into the Lord Jesus, as his body is immersed in the water. His soul rises with the Lord Jesus, as his body rises out of the water; and into one spirit with all the family of God he is immersed.”†

* Natural Law in the Spiritual World, p. 66.

† Christian System, p. 247.

If a person is not born of what he receives, but must be immersed in the water of regeneration before he can enter the kingdom of God, there can be no great impassable gulf fixed between the natural and the spiritual world. And the passage from the one world to the other can not be hermetically sealed on the natural side. The chasm is a very narrow insignificant affair filled with water. And the crossing is easily accomplished; all a person has to do is to be immersed, and into the kingdom of God he comes. He is not born from above, but from beneath. There is nothing that comes down to him, that brings him into the kingdom above him, on the contrary, he is brought up into it by going down into the water. But a man must be born of the Spirit—born of that which he receives—or he can never have any spiritual life. It can be truly said, that no belief of a fact, no reformation of the life, no confession to the truth of a fact, no immersion, no number of benevolent acts can endow a single soul with the attribute of spiritual life.

“The spiritual world is guarded from the world next in order beneath it by a law of Biogenesis—‘except a man be born again.’ . . . ‘except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God.’ It is not said, in this enunciation of the law, that if the condition be not fulfilled

the natural man will not enter the kingdom of God. The word is 'can not.' For the exclusion of the spiritually inorganic from the kingdom of the spiritually organic is not arbitrary. Nor is the natural man refused admission on unexplained grounds. His admission is a scientific impossibility. Except a mineral be born 'from above'—from the kingdom just above it—it can not enter the kingdom just above it. And except a man be born 'from above' by the same law, he can not enter into the kingdom just above him. There being no passage from one kingdom to another, whether from inorganic to organic, or from organic to spiritual, the intervention of life is a scientific necessity if a stone or plant or animal or a man is to pass from a lower to a higher sphere. The plant stretches down to the dead world beneath it, touches its minerals and gases with its mystery of life, and brings them up enobled and transformed to the living sphere. The breath of God, blowing where it listeth touches with its mystery of life the dead souls of men, bears them across the bridgeless gulf between the natural and the spiritual, between the spiritual inorganic, and the spiritual organic, endows them with its own high qualities, and develops within them these new and secret faculties, by which those who are born again are said to see the Kingdom of God." *

*Natural Law in Spirit World, p. 66.

Nothing of this kind takes place when a person is immersed. And the author of this system of faith declares that "a person can not be said to be born again of anything which he receives," not even of the baptism of the Holy Spirit, as in the case of Cornelius, hence no moral change can be wrought in the soul by the administration of this rite. Christ said of the new birth: "Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again. The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit." This language undoubtedly means that the work of the Spirit in regeneration is unseen and indiscernible to the natural eye. But there is nothing mysterious or invisible about this work, if it is accomplished by immersion. What similarity is there between a person being immersed in the water, and the blowing of the wind? You can not see the wind, tell from whence it comes, nor whither it goes. But you can see the water, trace it to its fountain head, and follow its course to the sea. At all times the water can be located, and those that have been immersed in it know all the details of their birth into the kingdom. There is not the slightest agreement between the teaching of the Saviour and the doctrine held by these teachers. This "ancient gospel" that they teach is not the same that Christ taught.

The doctrine of baptismal regeneration as held by the followers of Campbell is contrary to the laws of Biogenesis, to common sense, and the express declaration of the Scriptures; therefore the conclusion is inevitable, that it is an absolute impossibility.



CHAPTER VII.

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION—ITS ABSURDITY.

“ In one sense a person is born of his father; but not until he is first born of his mother. So in every place where water and the Spirit, or water and the Word, are spoken of, *the water stands first*. Every child is born of its father when it is born of its mother. Hence, the Saviour put the mother first, and the Apostles follow him . . . Being born imparts no new life; but is simply *a change of state*, and introduces into *a new mode of living* . . . *All the means of salvation are means of enjoyment, not of procurement*. Birth itself is not for procuring, but for enjoying, the life possessed before birth. So in analogy:—no one is to be baptized, or to be buried with Christ; no one is to be put under the water of regeneration for the purpose of *procuring* life, but for the purpose of *enjoying* the life of which he is possessed.”

Christian System, pp. 201, 207, 266.

However plausible the assertion that birth is not for the procurement, but for the enjoyment of life, may seem at first sight, it is not founded on fact. It is true that a child before birth has both a foetal life and the possibility of a larger life, but the latter can only be obtained by entrance into a larger sphere; where by correspondence with the earth, the air, and the sun its latent organs and faculties, that otherwise are destined to perish, may be developed. And, strictly speaking, this foetal life is all the life a child can be said to possess previous to its birth. It is not born into the world simply to enjoy this lower

form of life, but for the purpose of procuring this higher form of life. It is dead to this higher life until after its advent into the world, and, if it never has any higher life than that possessed prior to birth, it is never said to have lived. Now, in the case of the sinner it is equally true, that he has both a natural life and the possibility of a spiritual life, but he can only procure this latter life by his entrance into the kingdom of God; where his soul is brought into correspondence with God, by which its dormant powers are reanimated. As the result of the fall man's soul became impaired, defiled, and deadened, but it was not entirely obliterated. Although his soul is devoid of life, yet it is still capable of being regenerated. It forms the basis of spiritual life. But if the sinner never possesses a life higher than that which he enjoys in his unregenerate state, it can never be said of him that he lived spiritually.

Man is spiritually dead. He does not possess spiritual life in any degree. There is no doctrine that is more clearly taught in the Scriptures than this. God said of the forbidden fruit: "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." Adam ate and died, for God can not lie. We know he did not die a physical death; therefore it must have been a spiritual death. And alas, for us, the effects of this death did not stop with him, but passed upon all of his posterity. We do not inherit from him a single spark of spirit-

ual life. Mr. Campbell says: "Thus by one man sin entered into the world, and death by that one sin; and so death, the wages of sin, has fallen on all the offspring of Adam, 'because in him they have all sinned, or been made mortal, and consequently are born under condemnation to that death which fell upon our common progenitor because of his transgression.'" * Now, if man is dead, to the truth of which this quotation seems clearly to attest, he can not be in the possession of spiritual life. Spiritual death is the separation of the soul from communion with God. The Bible teaches that this separation is complete, therefore the death must be complete.

Half truths are always the most deceptive. The statement that "birth itself is not for procuring" life has sufficient appearance of truth to deceive the uninformed. But unfortunately for the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, it is for procuring life. But we will admit without argument that immersion does not procure life. The sinner has no soul life, and as he is not immersed for the purpose of procuring life, of course he is as dead spiritually on coming out of the water as he was before entering it. If a person is only "put under the water of regeneration for the purpose of enjoying the life of which he is possessed," we are perfectly willing to concede the point; for physical life is all the life

* *Christian System*, p. 27.

which he possesses. And a bath, as a general thing, is highly conducive to the health and vigor of the body. Though Campbell admonishes others not to speak of immersion as a mere bodily act, yet in this place he himself virtually admits that it is only a bodily act. And if this act does not procure life, what, in the name of common sense, is the use of being immersed? A person can get just as much enjoyment by taking a bath privately. According to this system Cornelius and his family enjoyed the blessings of life before they were born. They were baptized with the Holy Spirit, and spake with tongues, and magnified God, giving every evidence of life; and had as yet never even been introduced to their mother. And if these persons obtained all the blessings of life without being baptized, simply through the exercise of faith, what is the use of any one going under the water to enjoy these blessings? Surely God is not a respecter of persons.

Cambellism smacks strongly of the doctrine of Pelagius, that man has sustained no moral injury by the fall. No one can come to any other conclusion, when he carefully considers its teachings and practical workings among the people. This doctrine is clearly taught when it is said that "being born imparts no new life;" and, that the sinner is immersed "for the purpose of enjoying the life of which he is possessed." There is no such thing, according to

this system, as moral depravity. It does not recognize any such thing as original sin.

The example that Mr. Campbell gives to illustrate the new birth is of an Englishman coming to this country desiring to become an American citizen. He is informed by "Columbus" that he must be born again; but he does not understand what this means. He is then told that he must go before a court and renounce his allegiance to Great Britain, and swear fidelity to the government of the United States. And he is assured that when he has complied with these conditions he will be a citizen of this country, and will receive naturalization papers as an evidence of his citizenship. This fable teaches that the sinner is an alien to the kingdom of heaven; and that the institution of baptism bestows upon him the rights of citizenship. There is no change in the character of the foreigner, he simply has crossed the great deep, and is living under a different form of government. Hence the sinner receives no moral change in immersion, he is simply introduced "into a new mode of living." He is changed from an alien to a naturalized citizen. He is morally the same, but this does not matter, as he has sustained no moral injury by the fall.

Regeneration is a change of state, it is true, but this is not all the benefit it bestows. The transformation is not altogether outward in its effect. It is

not merely a change of state, or the introduction into a new mode of living. It involves all this, but it is something far deeper. It is a change of heart, a complete renovation of the moral nature, a resurrection, a passing from death to life. It is not the old life placed under new conditions. Old things have passed away, and all things have become new. The things that were once loved are now hated, and the things that were hated are now loved.

The word regenerate, as used in the gospel, means reproduction. But if a person is already in possession of life, he can not be born again, for there is nothing in him to be reproduced. The only subject of regenerating grace is a soul devoid of life. And no one can be born again without having a new life engendered within him. The apostle refers to the original production of life in the soul, when he says, God "hath begotten us again." Sin caused the destruction of life in the beginning, and this regenerating act needs to be performed in order that the soul may live again. It became so degenerated and polluted by sin that no mending or repairing would answer, it must be renewed by the quickening power of the Holy Spirit. And this new animating principle that is thus engendered in the soul lifts it at once from the death of sin to the life of righteousness.

The moral change by which the soul is reunited

with God is represented in the Scriptures as a resurrection from the dead. The old nature in us is so carnal and perverse that it needs an entire renovation. And this transformation is radical and complete. The old nature, called the old man, is put off, crucified, and put to death. And the new nature, spoken of as the new man, is put on, and called a new creature, or, more properly, a new creation. If "being born imparts no new life" it would be a perversion of the truth to represent the work of regeneration by such symbols as these. They plainly indicate that it is not a mere change of state, but an inward spiritual change. If the doctrine of baptismal regeneration is true, there is no change wrought in the nature of the soul. And all the benefit that accrues to the person who is regenerated—immersed—is to his physical man. There can be as much benefit derived from an ordinary bath as can be procured by going under "the water of regeneration." And he who submits to this institution, expecting to be made better morally, is deceived; for the whole thing is an empty form—a mere farce.

This system makes a person, no matter how backsliden or vile he has become, a naturalized citizen of the kingdom of heaven. And, at the same time, it teaches that a man, no matter how pure and upright he may have always lived, is in the kingdom

of the devil, simply because he has not been immersed. Though the Scriptures make use of the term alien, yet they nowhere recognize the unbaptized person as such, because he has not been baptized. And if a person is a citizen of the kingdom after he has become besotted in sin, and he continues in his sinful condition until death overtakes him it involves the absurdity, that either immersion is an act which render a person's calling and election sure, no matter what his character may be, or that he will go down to the kingdom of everlasting death, while by virtue of his immersion he is a member of the kingdom of heaven.

If the doctrine of baptismal regeneration is true, it involves the absurdity of making the regeneration of the soul depend more upon the administrator of the rite of baptism, than it does upon, either the goodness and mercy of God, or the repentance and faith of the individual himself. It makes no difference how strong his faith may be; how sincerely he repents of his sins; how earnestly he pleads for salvation; he can not be saved until he can find some one willing to immerse him. If he fails to find any one to put him under "the water of regeneration," or when found he refuses to comply with his request; and he dies without being immersed, his soul is hopelessly lost, not through any fault of his own, but because the condition of salvation was such that he

could not comply with it. Can we suppose that a God of infinite wisdom would make the destiny of an immortal soul depend on any such a contingency? This doctrine so limits the power of the God of Omnipotence that he can not regenerate a single soul without calling to his aid one of his finite creatures. The fact that it is derogatory to the character of God ought to be sufficient to condemn the doctrine, if there was nothing more against.

Christianity was designed by its author to be the universal religion. It stands to reason, therefore, that the means of salvation should be so adapted, that they would meet universally the conditions and circumstances under which the various families of the human race are placed. If this religion is for all mankind, it ought to be attainable in all lands and by all peoples. But, if this doctrine of regeneration by immersion is true, it can never be universal in its application. The chief tenet of Campbellism is, where there is no immersion, there can be no salvation. But immersion is not possible under all circumstances, nor practicable in all lands. In such countries as Greenland, Iceland, Labrador, Lapland, Siberia, Central Russia, and other countries within the cold regions of the North, the conditions would rarely ever be favorable to immerse their inhabitants. The mean annual temperature of many of these lands is seldom above the freezing point. For the

greater portion of the year their lakes and rivers are frozen to such a depth that to put any one under "the water of regeneration" would be an impossibility. Christ has said: "Go ye therefore, and disciple all nations, immersing them into the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit."* But the advocates of this doctrine can not go and disciple these nations; for the impracticability of immersing them imposes a barrier that can not be overcome. There are millions of the human race that dwell in these far-off lands that can not be saved, because the plan of salvation has been so arranged that it is impossible for them to meet its conditions. And this is not applicable alone to the nations that inhabit the Arctic regions, but falls with equal force upon those who live in the tropics. In the torrid plains of Africa and Asia the water supply is barely sufficient to sustain life. A person may travel over large areas of these countries and not find sufficient water to slake his thirst, let alone in which to immerse any one.

And this does not apply only to the inhabitants of the ice-bound regions of the frigid zones, or to the burning sands of the torrid zones, but to a much larger portion of the population of the globe. Often in our own land the cold is so intense in the winter that we can not immerse. We may safely reckon

* Campbellite New Testament.

six months in the year in which a person can not be immersed, either without great inconvenience or without seriously endangering his health. Some times the drought prevails to such an extent that all the streams and pools are dried up, which renders it extremely difficult to find water enough for the purpose of immersion. This has led these people to construct baptistries in their churches. But baptistries, baptismal gowns, and baptismal pants are the legitimate offsprings of necessity; and are only apologies for the impracticability of immersion. By these inventions they seek to surmount the difficulties that immersion imposes, that would otherwise debar men from the kingdom of God. But even by the aid of the inventions that they have sought out, they do not always overcome the obstacles with which they meet. An incident occurred in the little village of F—, in the state of Iowa, that illustrates the practical workings of this system. The Disciples began a protracted meeting in this town in the middle of the winter, and during the progress of the meeting the weather turned extremely cold. The brethren had made ample provisions—by filling the baptistry with water—to bring all that might desire salvation into the kingdom. Three persons came forward, one night, and made “the noble confession” which the “angels witnessed.” But when the cover was lifted off of the baptistry, lo, the water had frozen into a

solid cake of ice. Souls were crying, "What must we do?" And they had been told that they must be immersed for the remission of sins; but it was impossible to immerse them here. Delays are dangerous; so they repaired to the creek, about two miles distance from the church. But once more were they doomed to disappointment; nature seems to have conspired against them. For when they attempted to cut the ice they found that the water had frozen to the very bottom of the creek. Here were, as it was facetiously remarked, "Three souls to be born and the mother froze up." It is natural for children to love their mother, and oh, how sad must have been the hearts of these brethren as they looked upon her who had given them birth, frozen as hard as adamant. But this is a matter of too vast importance to ridicule. We wish we were caricaturing instead of presenting the facts as they transpired; for immortal souls are at stake. If these persons had died there could have been no hope of their being saved, because God (?) required something of them that they could not do. The ice, however, is not the only hindrance with which they meet in endeavoring to carry out their doctrinal scheme. Sometimes, after they prepare for an immersion, the water all leaks out, and when they come seeking the mother they find the baptistry empty. How appro-

pritate it would be for them to sing, on such occasions: "Empty is the baptistry, mother's gone."

This theory does not only require a temperate climate, but a degree of health which the candidate does not always possess. How large a portion of our race are actually laboring under lingering diseases, which for years deprive them of the power to be immersed. And those who are brought to repentance on a death bed can not be "put under the water of regeneration," though they may be anxious to fulfil this requirement. Numerous cases might be adduced to prove this, but one will be sufficient. A young man on one of my charges, a son of a member of this Church, was fast wasting away with that dreadful disease of consumption; he repented of his sins and desired to put on Christ by baptism. But in his case immersion was impossible without its causing instant death. The young man felt that he ought to be baptized, but was not particular as to the mode; and after consulting with the brethren they sent for my local preacher, who, in the presence of one of their preachers and a houseful of the members of the Church, baptized him by sprinkling. And from that day to this, not one of them has ever been known to mention the circumstance.

If the doctrine of baptismal regeneration is true, then God has established, as a condition to salvation,

that which in his infinite knowledge he must have seen was unadapted to the circumstances under which a large part of the inhabitants of the earth are placed. It does not speak well for his wisdom and goodness that he has instituted immersion as the "crowning act of man's restoration to God's favor," which is either oppressively burdensome or totally impracticable to thousands of the race. It can not be that a God of infinite goodness and love has so hedged in the way of life that thousands must be lost, no matter how strong their faith, sincere their repentance, or fervent their prayers, because their health will not permit, or their lot has been cast in a land where the temperature is not sufficiently moderate to allow them to be immersed.

But if faith is the condition on which spiritual life is granted, we can see how well it meets the exigency of every possible case. It does not matter where a man may be found, or under what circumstances he may be placed; whether he dwells in the regions of perpetual frosts or amidst the burning sands of the tropics; whether he is free to roam or is confined behind prison bars; whether he exults in the vigor of health or wastes away of some lingering disease; whenever and wherever he will look to the Lord Jesus Christ by faith he can be saved.

If God established the Christian religion for unlimited application—for the whole world—it must,

of necessity, be obtainable under universal conditions. But immersion—the “act of turning to God”—is not applicable under all conditions, and can not be complied with under all circumstances; therefore it is not the condition on which spiritual life is granted to the soul. The doctrine of baptismal regeneration is derogatory to the character of God, and it involves the whole system of religion in a bundle of absurdities. And surely the reader must be convinced, by this time, that this doctrine is wholly false and unutterably absurd.



CHAPTER VIII.

IS IMMERSION THE MODE OF BAPTISM ?

“The change which is consummated by immersion is sometimes called in sacred style, ‘being quickened,’ or ‘made alive,’ ‘passing from death to life,’ ‘being born again,’ ‘having risen with Christ,’ ‘turning to the Lord,’ ‘repentance unto life.’ . . . All is mental and invisible before coming out of the water, and as immersion is the first act commanded, and the first constitutional act, so it was, in the commission, the act by which the Apostles were commanded to turn or convert those to God who believed their testimony. In this sense, then, it is the converting act. No man can scripturally be said to be converted to God until he is immersed.”

Christian System, pp. 60, 210.

All of the doctrines of Campbellism are based upon the assumption that immersion alone is baptism. And if it can be established beyond a reasonable doubt that immersion is not the mode of baptism, this whole system falls to the ground. If, on the examination of the grounds for exclusive immersion, even a doubt arises in the mind as to whether this is the mode of baptism, just that much discredit is thrown upon this doctrinal system. If it is the mode, it does not prove that these doctrines are true; but if it is not the mode they can not be true. And it is not necessary, in order to show that immersion is not the mode of baptism, to prove that affusion is the mode. The burden of proof rests entirely upon

our opponents. They must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that immersion is the only mode of baptism.

The Greek word *baptizo*, which is transcribed into our language baptize, is pre-eminently the pivotal word in this discussion. About its meaning the battle has always raged the thickest. It is claimed that it has but one, and only one, meaning, being "as definite, clear, and unequivocal, as any word in any language ever spoken." It is held by immersionists that this term denotes the action or mode alone in which anything is done, but we understand it to be a generic and not a specific word, expressing the thing done, and not the manner in which it is done. No one word can be taken as the equivalent of *baptizo*, for one word can not exhaust its meaning. If it can be definitely shown that this word is generic in its signification, then the question is decided, and there is no escape from the verdict. How, and in what sense, then, is it used? Let us carefully search out its meaning. There are two primary causes that fix the signification of words, namely, derivation and usage. What then first is the derivation of *baptizo*? It is derived from the word *bapto*. It will be in the line of our investigations first to inquire into the meaning and use of this word. And if we find that *bapto*, the root of *baptizo*, does not always signify immerse, then it will be conclusive evidence that its derivative does not always mean this.

The word *bapto* originally meant to dip, but its meaning was enlarged by extension. And from signifying dip, it came to signify to dye by dipping, because this was the usual way of dyeing; and finally from dyeing by dipping, it came to denote dyeing in any manner. At length, it came to have these various meanings, acquired in its use in connection with the dyer's art, independent of their origin. The verb "to ship" is a good example of how words extend their meaning. It once meant to transport by ship, but it has now come to mean any manner of transportation. Lexicographers who have devoted their lives to the study of the Greek language, and who, by their diversified reading and research have had the opportunity to observe this word in every variety of position, relation and contrast, are entitled to speak with authority as to its signification.

In order that the reader may see for himself the various definitions of this term, we give below the different words by which it is rendered:

Bedew	Dye	Plunge	Steep
Color	Imbue	Sprinkle	Tinge
Dip	Immerse	Smear	Wash
Draw	Moisten	Stain	Wet.

Although the opinions of learned men carry with them great weight; yet, after all, usage is the sole arbiter of language. And that the reader may have the opportunity of seeing this word as it is used both in the Classics and the Scriptures, the following ex-

amples are given. Homer, in his battle of Frogs and Mice, says: "He breathless fell, and the lake was tinged (*bapto*) with the purple blood." Certainly no one will contend that the lake was immersed in the blood of a single frog. Aristophanes informs us that: "Magnes, an old comic actor of Athens, used the Lydian music, shaved his face, and smeared (*bapto*) it with tawny washes." He did not dip his face into the washes, but they were rubbed or smeared over his face. Dr. Carson, an eminent Baptist critic, admits that "By anything implied or referred to in this example it could not be known that *bapto* ever signifies to dip." Hippocrates, speaking of the liquid used in the dyer's art, says: "When it drops upon the garments they are dyed (*bapto*).". Here is a clear case of baptism, so to speak, by the dropping of the liquid, as it was sprinkled or poured upon the garments.

In the Greek translation of the Old Testament, called the Septuagint, which was made about two hundred and seventy years before Christ, this word occurs in several places, but in none of them does it mean immerse. We notice first, Lev. xiv, 3-6: "If the plague of leprosy be healed in the leper, then the priest shall command to take for him that is to be cleansed two birds alive and clean, and cedar wood, and scarlet, and hyssop, and the priests shall command that one of the birds be killed in an earthen

vessel over running water: as for the living bird, he shall take it, and the cedar wood, and the scarlet, and the hyssop, and shall dip (*bapto*) them and the living bird in the blood of the bird that was killed over the running water." It would be an utter impossibility to immerse the living bird in the blood of the dead one, to say nothing of the cedar wood, and the scarlet, and the hyssop. In this passage *bapto* can not possibly mean more than to smear, stain, or wet with the blood. This word occurs again in the sixteenth verse of the same chapter: "The priest shall dip (*bapto*) his right finger in the oil that is in his left hand, and shall sprinkle of the oil with his finger seven times before the Lord." A person can not hold sufficient oil in the hollow of his hand to admit of the total immersion of his finger. The priest must, therefore, have moistened his finger with the oil that he held in his hand. An account is given of the strange punishment of the king of Babylon, in Daniel iv, 33: "The same hour was the thing fulfilled upon Nebuchadnezzar, and he was driven from men, and did eat grass as oxen, and his body was wet (*bapto*) with the dew of heaven." The word in this instance is rendered wet, but it can not admit of the idea of immersion. The wetting was not brought about by dipping or plunging, but by the dew of heaven gently falling upon his body, which was the most mild form of sprinkling. Dr.

Cox, a distinguished immersionist, says the use of *bapto* in this case: "It does not imply the manner in which the effect was produced, but the effect itself; not the mode by which the body of the king was wetted, but its condition, as resulting from exposure to the dew of heaven." He admits that this word expresses the thing done, and not the manner of doing it; and this is the meaning that we claim it has, not only in this case, but wherever it is used. These examples prove conclusively, that, neither in its classical, nor scriptural use does *bapto*, have the exclusive meaning of immerse. Baptism was performed with water, blood, dye, oil and dew, yet there is not the least hint that in any instance it was by immersion. And as this word has so many different significations, *baptizo* can not be more specific in meaning than its root.

An examination into the meaning and usage of *baptizo* will now be in order. Mr. Campbell says: "The ancient lexicons with one consent, give *immerse* as the natural, common, and primary sense of this word. There is not known to us a single exception. Nor is there a received lexicon ancient or modern, that does ever translate this word by the terms sprinkling or pouring."* This would be convincing evidence for the univocal meaning of this word, if it were not for just one thing—it is not true. He

* Christian System, p. 55.

either never examined the ancient and modern lexicons, or else he willfully misrepresented them. For we have the authority of such masters of the Greek language as Schrevelius and Schleusner, whose lexicons have long been standard works, that this word does signify both to sprinkle and to pour. It is not claimed by us that this is the only meaning of the word, but that sprinkle is one of its meanings. A few of the words by which *baptizo* is translated are given below, any one of which is a natural, common, and literal meaning of the term.

Besmear	Dip	Overwhelm	Purify
Cleanse	Imbue	Plunge	Sprinkle
Consecrate	Immerse	Pour	Wash
Devote	Moisten	Purge	Wet.

We might introduce many passages to illustrate the use of this word, but two or three will be sufficient. Justin declares that: "Sprinkling with holy water was invented by demons in imitation of the true baptism signified by the prophets, that their votaries might have their pretended purifications by water." Here sprinkling and baptism are used as synonymous terms, clearly indicating that he regarded sprinkling with water as baptism. Nowhere do the prophets foretell that immersion should be baptism, on the contrary, as is intimated here, they bear testimony in favor of affusion. Greagory Nazianzen says: "I know of a fourth baptism, that of mar-

tyrdom and blood, and I know of a fifth, that of tears." The martyr was baptized by his blood flowing over his body, and the baptism of tears was by the tears running down the face. These baptisms were by either sprinkling or pouring. Origen, whose native language was the Greek, uses this same word *baptizo* in speaking of the water that was poured upon the altar on Mount Carmel by the command of Elijah. He says: "How came you to think that Elias when he should come, would baptize, when he did not, in Ahab's time, baptize the wood upon the altar. . . But ordered the priests to do that. . . He therefore, that did not himself baptize then, but assigned the work to others, how was he likely to baptize, when he, according to Malichi's prophecy, should come?" Any person that is at all familiar with the Scriptures knows that on this occasion the water was poured upon the wood out of vessels at three different times. The greatest scholar in the early Church did not believe that *baptizo* invariably meant to immerse, or he never would have used it in referring to this circumstance. He must have understood pouring to be baptism, or he would not have employed *baptizo* in this connection.

The Greeks never used *baptizo* in a religious sense, and the Jews never employed it in any other sense. The Greek of the New Testament is not Classic Greek, but is Hebraistic Greek, that is, Hebrew ideas

expressed in Greek words. If this word had always been used in the Classics in the sense of immerse, it would not determine its meaning when employed in the Scriptures. For classical usage is not a safe criterion for judging the meaning of Scriptural terms. The real meaning of *baptizo* as it is used in connection with the rite of baptism, can only be ascertained by a careful examination of the passages in which it occurs in the New Testament.

The first text in which this word is used that we can learn anything with reference to the mode of application of the water is Mark vii, 2-4: "And when they saw some of his disciples eat bread with defiled, that is to say, with unwashen, hands, they found fault. For the Pharisees and all the Jews, except they wash their hands oft, eat not, holding the tradition of the elders. And when they come from the market, except they wash (baptize themselves) they eat not. And many other things there be, which they have received to hold, as the washing of cups and pots, brazen vessels, and of tables." Had *baptizo* been anglicized in this place, instead of being translated by the word wash, much light would have been thrown upon the subject of baptism to those not familiar with the original language. The two phrases "wash their hands" and "baptize themselves" are used synonymously. The manner of doing a thing now is the same in this country that it

was two thousand years ago, for customs never change in the East. Modern travelers inform us that the prevailing custom at the present time is to wash the hands by having water poured upon them. And it is a well authenticated fact that the manner of washing hands among the Jews was by pouring water upon them, for which purpose a servant was employed. This is made evident from the language of II Kings, iii, 11: "Here is Elisha, the son of Shophat, which poured water on the hands of Elijah." It makes it all the more certain that this baptism was not by immersion, from the fact that the clothes became defiled as well as the body, when anyone was made unclean. These washings were very frequent, and it is not reasonable to suppose that the Jews deliberately placed upon themselves such grievous burdens as would be involved if the mode of these baptisms was immersion. It might be claimed that the cups, pots and brazen vessels were immersed, but the purpose was to make them clean ceremonially, and not to cleanse them in the ordinary sense of the word. In Christ's reply to a certain Pharisee, it is indicated that these vessels were not dipped: "Now do ye Pharisees make clean the outside of the cup and the platter, but your inward part is full of ravening and wickedness." If they had immersed the vessels the inside would have been made clean as well as the outside. The tables,

that is, beds, were large couches on which the Jews reclined while eating. And it is absurd to suppose that they immersed their beds before eating. For it would be a long time before they were fit for use again, if they dipped them in the water instead of sprinkling them with it.

In John iii, 25-6, we are told that : " There arose a question between some of John's disciples and the Jews about purifying. And they came unto John and said unto him, Rabbi, he that was with thee beyond Jordan, to whom thou bearest witness, behold, the same baptizeth, and all men come to him." We have here unmistakable proof that baptism and purification are one and the same thing. The dispute was about purifying, and to settle the question an appeal was made to John on the subject of baptism. And if the decision of a question on baptism could settle a controversy on purification, the two terms of necessity must have the same signification. Both John's baptism and that of the Saviour, then, were Jewish purifications ; and could not, therefore, have been by immersion. It is made clear from the circumstances attending the miracle at Cana, that the Jews did not submerge their whole bodies in water in order to purify themselves : " There were set there six water pots of stone, after the manner of the purifying of the Jews, containing two or three firkins apiece." (Jno. ii, 6.) The capacity of these vessels

was somewhere from six to ten gallons. Surely no one will claim that they were large enough to admit of immersion. They were no doubt kept filled with water in readiness, that in the frequent use of water in their purifications, they might dip out what they needed without having to bring it from a distance. St. Paul gives further light on this subject, when speaking of the ceremonial cleansing required by the law, he says: "Which stood only in meats and drinks, and diverse washings (baptisms) and cardinal ordinances." (Heb. ix, 10.) These baptisms were many and differed from each other; for this is the sense in which the word diverse is used. If *baptizo* is a word that expressess the mode, or manner of doing any thing, then this passage proves that there were various modes of administering these baptisms. It proves entirely too much for immersionists; for there can never be any diversity in immersion as a mode. Nowhere do we read that immersion was enjoined upon the people under the law. The ceremonial cleansings, or baptisms, under the Levitical law were all performed by sprinkling water, blood, or oil upon the persons to be purified. The apostle refers to these various washings calling them baptisms, which shows beyond a doubt that *baptizo* was not used by the New Testament writers to mean immerse only, but is unquestionably employed to signify baptisms that were by sprinkling.

Again in I Cor. x, 1-2, it is said: "All our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." It is plainly stated that there was a baptism on this occasion, but it could not have been by immersion. The attempt is made to prove an immersion here by asserting that the cloud rested on the two walls formed by the water, making a kind of tunnel, and that as the children of Israel passed through they were immersed. But if this was an immersion it is the driest one on record. For at no time were they either under the water, or in the water; but were all the time in the open air walking on dry ground. It is a mistake, however, to say that the cloud closed them in, forming a tunnel; for we learn that before they entered the sea, the cloud passed over them and stood between them and the Egyptians. The only time that they were under the cloud was before they entered the sea, and if they were baptized by the cloud it was while standing on the shore. The baptism that they received in the sea must have been from the spray blowing over them. Paul says that the Israelites were baptized; they were not immersed; therefore they were baptized by affusion. Had the apostle said that the Egyptians were baptized we would concede the point at once that they were immersed; for they were as thoroughly wet as though immersion had been their mode of heathenish baptism.

It must be evident to every unbiased reader, that the usage of the term *baptizo* in the New Testament does not justify the claim that it has no other signification but immerse. The examples cited make the fact clear as light, that it is used in a broad sense, including the application of water in any manner, whatever; and not in the narrow and restricted sense of immersion. The evidence, so far as the use of this word is concerned, is against the idea of exclusive immersion, and is in favor of affusion as the true mode of baptism.

But what *baptizo* lacks in proving the theory of exclusive immersion is sought to be made up by the use of the prepositions *apo*, *eis*, *ek*, and *en*. A fair example of the argument from the use of these words is given by Mr. Campbell; he says: "Sprinkled them in the Jordan! poured them in the Jordan! immersed them in the Jordan. Can any one doubt which of these truly represents the original in such passages? I may sprinkle or pour water upon a person; but to sprinkle or pour them into water is impossible. It is not said he baptized water upon them, but he baptized them in water, in the river."* It is by such sophistry as this that the doctrine of exclusive immersion is supported. The whole force of the argument in favor of immersion, which is deduced from such expressions as "in the Jor-

* Christian System, p. 56.

dan," "into the water," and "out of the water" is based upon the use of these four Greek particles. There is almost as much stress placed on their use as there is on *baptizo* itself, and this method of reasoning has more effect on the uninformed than any other.

The translators of the authorized version of the New Testament have rendered these prepositions into English by various terms. *Apo* is translated by twenty-four different expressions, *eis* by thirty-six, *ek* by twenty-three, and *en* by thirty-two. By actual count *apo* is rendered in the New Testament by from, three hundred and seventy-four times, *eis* by to or unto, five hundred and thirty-eight times, *ek* by from, one hundred and eighty-six times, and *en* by at, over a hundred, and by with, one hundred and fifty times. It will greatly aid the reader in the study of this subject to see how these words are rendered.

We give a few of their many meanings below.

<i>Apo</i>	<i>Eis</i>	<i>Ek</i>	<i>En</i>
According to	About	After	Among
After	Among	Among	As
At	Against	At	As to
Away from	At	Away from	Before
By	For	Because of	By
Down from	In	By	By means of
For	Into	For	Concerning
From	In order to	From	In
Far from	On account of	Of	Into
Of	Near to	On account of	In order to
On account of	To	Out of	In reference to
Out of	Towards	On	Near to
Towards	Unto	Upon	To
With	Upon	Through	Within.

It is only those who have a theory to maintain, even at the expense of the truth, that can find any support for immersion in the use of these prepositions.

It makes just as good sense, and is just as literal rendering of the Greek to say, John baptized at the Jordan or with (the water of) the Jordan. They went down to the water, and came up from the water. And there is not the least absurdity in saying he sprinkled them at, near, by, or with the Jordan. For John baptized "with water," which implies that the water was applied to the subject, and not the subject to the water. But if these words were always translated as immersionist claim they should be, it would involve the Scriptures in a thousand of the greatest absurdities imaginable.

Let us illustrate this by substituting the so-called specific meaning of these terms in some of the places where they occur in the gospel. "Depart out of (*apo*) me ye workers of iniquity." (Mtt. vii, 23.) "Let him come down out of (*apo*) the cross." (Mtt. xxvii, 23.) Shake off the dust out of (*apo*) your feet." (Mtt. xxvii, 42.) "And the angel departed out of (*apo*) her." (Lk. ix, 5.) "And Jesus went away again beyond Jordan into (*eis*) the place where John at first baptized and there he abode. And many resorted to him." (Jno. x, 40.) The advocates of immersion contend that beyond Jordan was in

Jordan, and as it is stated that Christ went into the place where John baptized and abode there, he must have lived in the river, and the people resorted to him in the midst of its waters.

Jno. xx. 1-8: "Peter therefore went forth, and that other disciple, and came into(*eis*) the sepulcher. So they ran both together, and the other disciple did outrun Peter, and came first into(*eis*) the sepulcher. And he stooping down, saw the linen clothes lying; yet went he not in. Then cometh Simon Peter following him, and went into(*eis*) the sepulcher, and seeth the linen clothes lie, and the napkin that was about his head, not lying with the linen clothes. . . Then went in also the other disciple which came first into(*eis*) the sepulcher." In every instance where approach to the sepulcher is mentioned *eis* is employed, though there was no entrance made. If it means into, then Peter and John came into the sepulcher, John came into it, yet went not in, and finally Peter went into it. What a bundle of contradictions this makes of the passage. The facts are they both came towards, John came to, and Peter entered the sepulcher. And his entrance is expressed by the double use of the preposition, which is the usual method of expressing an entrance. The preposition is prefixed to the verb went, and then follows it; and the literal rendering of it would be "into—went into (*eiselthen eis*) the sepulcher."

Now, when this double use of the preposition does not occur, unless it is implied in something in the sentence besides the preposition, an entrance is not expressed. The force of the preposition itself is not sufficient to express it. And nowhere is there a double use of one of these particles, where it speaks of going down into or coming up out of the water. And there is positively nothing in the context of these passages to indicate an entrance into the water. "He agreed with his laborers out of (*ek*) a penny a day." (Mtt. xx, 2.) "The baptism of John, whence was it, out of (*ek*) heaven, or out of (*ek*) men." (Mtt. xxi, 25.) "She saith unto him, grant that these my two sons may sit, the one out of (*ek*) thy right hand, and the other out of (*ek*) the left, in thy kingdom." (Mtt. xx, 21.) "Swear not at all, neither in (*en*) heaven. . . . Neither shalt thou swear in (*en*) thy head." (Mtt. v, 34, 36.) "They that take the sword shall perish in (*en*) the sword." (Mtt. 26, 52.) "There was in the synagogue a man in (*en*) an unclean spirit." (Mk. i, 23.) "If the salt have lost his savour, in (*en*) what shall it be seasoned." (Lk. xiv, 34.)

There is nothing, whatever, in the use of the Greek words that are employed in connection with the rite of baptism to prove that immersion was the mode practiced by the apostles. It might be a mode, but there is nothing to show that it was the mode. The language of the New Testament seems to favor

sprinkling instead of immersion. If immersion is the mode, it must be proven by something besides the word *baptizo* and the Greek particles.



CHAPER IX.

IS IMMERSION SCRIPTURE BAPTISM?

“The ancient Church, it is admitted on all hands, practiced immersion. It did so, Roman, Greek and English historians being worthy of any credit. The places where baptism was anciently administered, being rivers, pools, baths, and places of much water, show that it was not sprinkling or pouring. They went down *into* the water, and came up *out* of it, etc. And John baptized where there were many waters or much water. And even Paul and Silas went out of the Philippian jail to baptize the jailer at night, rather than send for a cup of water! It is also alluded to and explained under the figure of a burial, and resurrection as relating to the death, burial and resurrection of Jesus.”

Christian System, p. 57.

If the fact can be established by any kind of evidence that even a single individual, of the many who were baptized in the primitive Church, was not immersed, this whole system of doctrines falls to the ground. For if any one was received into the Church without being immersed, it can not be a necessary condition to the pardon of sins. We do not have to adduce a single instance where a person was ever baptized by affusion. All that we need to do is to present a case where this rite could not have been administered by immersion. An impartial examination of the circumstances under which the baptisms took place that are recorded in the New Testament will be necessary, in order to show that they do not favor the theory of immersion.

In the consideration of this subject, the first question that demands our attention is, What was the mode of John's baptism? If the mode the Baptist employed in the administration of this ordinance can be determined, it will not be difficult to learn what the mode of Christian baptism was. He did not baptize with Christian baptism, but the mode of his baptism was the same as the apostles used. He was a Jewish prophet, who lived under the law of Moses, and he would naturally use the Jewish baptism. Indeed, it would have been impossible for him to have instituted a new mode of baptism without provoking the bitterest opposition from the Scribes and Pharisees, who did not believe his testimony or acknowledge his authority. They were ever ready with their protests if the Saviour deviated in the least thing, even from the traditions of the elders, and it is not probable that they would have been less critical had John made any innovations on the Levitical law. If he immersed he must have changed the Mosaical rites, for none of the diverse baptisms of the law, which the priests administered, were by immersion. And it is not reasonable to suppose that the people would submit to such an innovation without a single protest. The abruptness with which he began his ministry clearly indicates that the people were so familiar with this ordinance that they were in no need of instruction on the subject. The legal washings

enjoined by the Levitical law had been long known as baptisms. John was anointed and sent of God, not to abolish the Jewish rites, but to revive the languishing state of Judaism, and prepare the people for the immediate coming of the Messiah. Now, by what mode did this prophet apply the water of baptism to the vast multitudes that attended his ministry? If the mode of his baptism was taken from the Levitical institutes, which is undoubtedly the case, he must have followed the example of Moses and "Sprinkled all the people." It is evident from the language of the Baptist himself that this was the mode of his baptism. In immersion the subject is applied to the water, and is, consequently, baptized in water. But John says: "I indeed baptize you with water." Here *en* is used to denote the instrumental cause, and therefore can not mean in water. And that this is the proper rendering of this passage is obvious from the clause, "He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost." This preposition can not in the one case mean "in," and in the other have "with" as its signification. No person is ever applied to the Holy Spirit, but is baptized with the Spirit. There must have been an exact similarity between John's baptism and that of the Holy Spirit. And as spiritual baptism was with the Holy Ghost, so that of John's must have been with the water.

The circumstances attending the Baptist's min-

istry make it wholly improbable that he immersed the people. One of the New Testament writers informs us that "the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and the land of Judea, and all the regions round about Jordan" were baptized by John. And as the statement is found in the plain narrative, we are bound to understand the Evangelist to mean the greater part of the people. The number of the inhabitants of Palestine at this time has been estimated at from six to fifteen millions. Taking six millions as the basis of the population, we will suppose that John baptized one half of the entire population of the Holy Land. This is placing the estimation very low, but we can afford to be liberal with our opponents. The duration of the Baptist's public ministry was not more than nine months, but we will place it at ten, as being the utmost limit to which it can be extended. If we estimate that he baptized ten hours each day during this length of time, not counting out the Sabbaths, in which, of course, he did not baptize, this would necessitate his baptizing ten thousand each day, one thousand each hour, and sixteen every minute, during all these months. The physical exertion that this would have required, if he baptized them by immersion, would have killed Samson himself in less than a month. John could not have possibly immersed two hundred thousand from the time he began his ministry until he was

imprisoned. And surely no one will estimate the "all" that received his baptism at less than one thirtieth of the inhabitants of the land.

The whole argument drawn from John's baptism in favor of immersion is from the locality in which the rite was administered. He baptized "in Jordan and in Ænon, near to Salem, because there was much water there." The river Jordan has a rapid, impetuous current which renders it exceedingly dangerous, so that the best swimmer can not bathe in it without endangering his life. At the place where it is said that John baptized, the stream runs with the fury of a rapid, and is six or seven feet deep close to the shore. The impracticability of immersing in the Jordan was recognized by Lieut. Lynch of the United States Navy, who surveyed it in 1848. Speaking of the baptism of Christ, he says: "The impetuous river, in grateful homage, must have stayed its course and gently laved the body of its Lord." While it might be possible to immerse a person in the Jordan, yet it would not have been possible to immerse the multitudes in such a deep and swift stream. Dr. Carson saw the difficulty of John administering this rite in the river. He says: "Instead of keeping John the Baptist ten hours every day in the water, I will not oblige him to go into the water at all; he might have stood on the brink." The Jordan has two or three distinct bot-

toms or banks which overflow in the wet season, and all within these banks is in Jordan. And a person may stand on dry ground on one of these bottoms, and still be said to be in Jordan. The Baptist may have baptized on the bank of the river without being near the water. But the scriptural evidence shows plainly that he did not baptize in the river. For we read where Jesus withdrew from the people, and "went away again beyond Jordan into the place where John first baptized." And again, "these things were done in Bethbara, beyond Jordan, where John was baptizing." It is also stated, in another place, that he baptized "in the wilderness." Now, unless Bethbara and the wilderness were in the river, and beyond Jordan is made to mean in Jordan, these passages prove conclusively that he did not baptize in the river. And if he did not baptize in the river, the mode of his baptism was not immersion.

The phrase "much water" is all that seems to have any force in the statement that John baptized in Ænon. The question is asked, "Why did he baptize where there was 'much water,' if it was not for the purpose of immersion?" The word Ænon is derived from a word that means well, or fountain, and the phrase *polla hudata*, "much water," should be translated "many waters." How much logical force is there in the argument drawn from the use of

the phrase "much water," when it is analyzed? It all amounts to this: John left the Jordan, the largest river in Palestine, which affords more water than all the streams of the country united together, and came to this place that he might be supplied with the water of a nameless brook or fountain in which to immerse the multitudes that attended his ministry. It could not, then, have been his object in going to this place to procure the "much water" for the purpose of immersion. The great number that came to hear his message would need considerable water for their own use. And as this was a place where there were several springs or a small stream, it suggests the idea that he removed his baptismal station here because it would furnish abundant supply of pure water for the use of the people. It must have been the quality of the water, therefore, and not the quantity, that led to his removal from Bethbara.

Let us now consider the first example of Christian baptism that occurred under the administration of the apostles. It was the baptism of the three thousand in the city of Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost. It is said that "They that gladly received his word were baptized, and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls." Is there any evidence that these persons were immersed? There is certainly not the least proof of

it, but the circumstances of the case clearly indicate some other mode. The apostles and their converts were all Jews, and were all familiar with the religious use of water under the law, hence there was no need of any instruction on the design or mode of baptism being given. And as none of the diverse baptisms of their law were by immersion, the converts would naturally expect baptism by affusion. And the time was entirely too short to immerse this multitude. It was nine o'clock when preaching began; and it is not probable that the sermon was ended, the inquiries made, the counsels given, and the true converts selected and examined before noon. They could not have well begun to baptize before one o'clock, and the Jewish day ends at six. This would leave only five hours, entirely too short a time in which to handle each person separately, as in immersion. It becomes still less probable when we consider that the people were not expecting to receive this rite, and must have been wholly unprepared for it with the necessary changes of raiment. The assumption that the seventy aided the apostles is unfounded, for they were only commissioned for a special purpose, and for a short time. There is no evidence that they were present, and if they were there, it only increases the difficulty of finding suitable places in which to immerse so many people. There could not be found

in Jerusalem twelve distinct places for the purpose of immersion, much less eighty-two of them. The Jordân was twenty miles away, and the brook Kidron was always dry at this season of the year. We are informed that the pools were used, but this is only an attempt to escape the difficulty in which the theory of immersion involves them. The two pools, Bethesda and Siloam, were in this vicinity, but neither of them was available. The first belonged to the temple, and it is not likely that the priests were so accommodating as to allow the apostles to immerse three thousand converts to the new religion in it. The pool of Siloam, which was about a mile distance, was used for family purposes, and there is no probability that the people would permit it to be used for the purpose of immersion. There is nothing to show in the narrative that they moved from the place where they were standing. The disciples had just been baptized with the Holy Ghost, which was poured upon them in fulfillment to Joel's prophecy. And it is not likely that immediately after they had all been baptized with the Spirit by affusion, that they would immerse the people. The probabilities are all against the supposition that the three thousand were immersed, while everything is favorable to their being baptized by affusion. But the burden of proof rests upon those who claim that they were immersed, both in regard to the time and the facilities.

The next example is that of the Ethiopian eunuch, recorded in the eighth chapter of Acts. The baptism took place on the road to Gaza, in a place that is called a "desert." There is no running stream in this region large enough to answer the purpose of immersion. Palestine does not abound in rivers, and wherever there is a small stream it is called a river. If there had been such a stream on this road it would have been noted as a river. The account reads: "They came to a certain water," a more correct rendering of *ti hudor* would be "some," or "a little water." There is nothing said as to whether it was a well, fountain, cistern, brook, or pool. It had no name, and it seems to have surprised the eunuch to come upon water in this out-of-the-way place. For he exclaims, *idou hudor*, behold water, as though the sight of it was wholly unexpected. He did not say behold a river or a fountain, but simply "behold water." The fact appears that there was some water here, but nothing is said of its depth or quantity. All the evidence there is of an immersion in this place is the statement: "They went down both into the water... and when they were come up out of the water." The going down affords no proof of immersion, for they both went "down." The going into the water is no evidence of immersion, for they both went "into the water." Being in water and under water are two very different things. To in-

sist that the phrase "went down both into the water" means that the eunuch was immersed proves too much, for it proves that Philip was also immersed. They may have, as we have already seen, only gone down to the water, and come up from the water. But if we admit that they went into the water for the purpose of baptizing the eunuch, it does not throw any light on the mode that was employed, for he could have sprinkled him as easily as to have immersed him. The argument reverts to the meaning of the word *baptizo* but it does not settle the controversy, for it means to sprinkle or pour as well as to immerse. It is begging the question to say the eunuch was baptized; *baptizo* means immerse; therefore he was immersed. We could prove that he was sprinkled by this method of reasoning, and it would be just as sound a conclusion as the other. But it has never been necessary for us to use any such arguments to sustain baptism by affusion.

Is there anything in the passage of Scripture, which Philip expounded to the eunuch, that could have directed his mind to the subject of baptism? This clause occurs in the passage which he was reading when Philip overtook him, "So shall he sprinkle many nations." The evangelist could not have expounded this prophetic description of the Messiah without explaining this clause. The sprinkling represents the moral cleansing of which baptism is the outward

sign. And Philip, in all probability was just giving an explanation of these words when the eunuch looked up and saw the water by the roadside, and exclaimed : " Behold, water ; what doth hinder me to be baptized ? " Nowhere in the Scriptures does it say : " So shall he immerse many nations. " And it is not at all probable that after he had explained to the eunuch this spiritual cleansing under the figure of sprinkling, that he would then immerse him. Mr. Campbell tries hard to break the force of the argument from this passage by endeavoring to show that it should read : " So shall he astonish many nations. " The reason he does this is because it furnishes such strong presumptive evidence against the hypothesis of immersion. But after a careful examination of all the texts in which the Hebrew word translated sprinkle occurs, Dr. Barnes, than whom there is no better authority, says : " In every instance it means to sprinkle. "

The baptism of Saul of Tarsus comes next in order. " And he received his sight forthwith and arose and was baptized. " (Acts ix, 18.) He was baptized in the city of Damascus, in the house of Judas, while in a standing posture. After he was brought to the city, he continued three days and nights without eating or drinking. This long fast with his grief and anxiety no doubt had greatly weakened him. When Ananias came he must have found

him prostrate with fasting and grief, and laying his hands upon his head, he delivered his message. And immediately the scales fell from his eyes, forthwith he received his sight, then he stood upon his feet, and was baptized. The account forbids the idea that he left the house. He was naturally greatly weakened by his long abstinence from food; but after his baptism, he partook of food and was strengthened. He evidently received refreshments before he left the house. For in the whole narrative where a person passes from one place to another, it is expressly stated. "As he journeyed, he came near Damascus," when struck down, "the Lord said unto him, Arise, and go into the city;" and "they led him by the hand, and brought him into Damascus." "And the Lord said unto him, Arise and go.... And Ananias went his way, and entered into the house." And there is nothing, whatever, to indicate that they left the house in search of water. The language signifies that the baptism took place immediately after the scales fell, and he received his sight. There are two facts that preclude the idea of immersion, in the first place he was in the house, and in the second he was standing on his feet. Here is a case where unquestionably the mode of baptism was not immersion.

In Acts x, 47-48, is given an account of the bap-

tism of Cornelius and his friends. Peter asks: "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we? And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord." "Can any man forbid water," that is, in plain English, Can any one forbid that water should be brought. This question was addressed to those of the circumcision, who had come with him from Joppa, whose concurrence he desired. What the apostle wished to know was whether they had any objections to these uncircumcised Gentiles being baptized with water, as God had put no difference between them and the Jews, baptizing them both alike with the Holy Ghost. And as there was no objection raised he commanded them to be baptized. There is not the least shadow of doubt that this all took place in the house. If it had been the intention to take them from the house to the river or pool, he would have said, can any man forbid these Gentile converts from going to the water. But he called for the water to be brought, and not that the people should be taken to the water. As he referred to the possible prohibition of the water he must have had the water in view, and not the conveyance of the people to it. These persons had just been baptized with the Holy Spirit which fell on them. The real and the symbolical baptisms are here placed in a most

striking parallel. They were baptized with the Spirit, and it is not likely that the apostle, in the face of this fact, would baptize them in any other way, than by the application of the water to them, or with water. This is another example where undoubtedly the mode was not immersion, but where all the circumstances go to show that it must have been affusion.

We next notice the baptism of the jailer and his family, which is recorded in the sixteenth chapter of Acts. Paul and Silas were imprisoned for preaching the gospel, and the jailer having received the charge to keep them safely, placed them in the inner prison. And at midnight there was an earthquake that broke open the doors of the prison. The jailer, supposing that the prisoners had all escaped, was about to take his own life, when Paul cried to him to do himself no harm that they were all there. And he sprang into the inner prison, and brought the apostle and his companion into the outer prison, where they preached the word of the Lord to him and his family. He brought some water to wash their stripes, and, no doubt, that he and his household were baptized with a part of this same water. They did not leave the prison to baptize the jailer. For he was a sworn officer, and could not have taken them out of the jail except at the risk of his life. It is evident from the language of the apostle that

they did not go out of the prison. The magistrates sent word privately to let them go: "But Paul said unto them, They have beaten us openly, uncondemned, being Romans, and have cast us into prison; and now do they thrust us out privily? nay verily; but let them come themselves and fetch us out." Now, if they were out at midnight it must have been privily, the very thing that Paul objects to doing. Such language is not in harmony with the assumption that all of them, the jailer, his family, and the two prisoners, were out of the prison in the middle of the night, contrary to the law, and in jeopardy of the jailer's life, wandering through the streets of the city in search of a suitable place to immerse. If they were out of the jail that night the apostle must have lied about it to the magistrates, and revealed himself to his late converts as a hypocrite. Such a supposition charges Paul with a duplicity unworthy the character of an apostle, and entirely repugnant to the principals of the gospel. He did not leave the prison during the night, therefore the jailer and his family were baptized in the house, and consequently were not immersed.

Romans vi, 3-4, is adduced as evidence that immersion is the true mode of baptism: "Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death. Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death." The

claim that baptism represents the death, burial and resurrection of Christ is without Scripture proof, and is only an effort to make the theory of immersion appear more plausible. The Lord's Supper symbolizes the death of Christ and it is not reasonable to suppose that two sacraments were instituted with the same import. There was no more religious signification in the burial of the Saviour, than there was in that of Lazarus or any other person. But if the assumption were true, there is no more resemblance between the momentary dipping of a person in water, and the burial of Christ in the sepulcher, than there is between day and night. This passage has no reference to water baptism, whatever. This is shown from the fact that the same idea is conveyed by three different figures. "Buried by baptism into death," "planted together in the likeness of his death," and "the old man is crucified with him." This passage must be interpreted in either a literal or in a spiritual sense, and not partly in a spiritual and partly in a literal sense. Nothing but the most flagrant inconsistency can possibly ascribe a meaning to the word baptize in one clause, that it does not have in the other and contrasted clause. If the burial is literal, then the planting, crucifixion, and death are literal also. But we can not believe that the persons of whom Paul speaks were literally planted, crucified, and dead. Hence the burial which is by

baptism must be a spiritual burial into a spiritual death. Mr. Campbell's American apostle, Prof. Stewart, says in his comment on this passage : "Indeed, what else but a moral burying can be meant, when the apostle goes on to say, 'we are buried with him (not by baptism only but) by baptism into death.' Of course, it will not be contended that a literal, physical burying is here meant, but only a moral one." If we are buried by baptism then the baptism does the burying, it is the burier, and not the burial as immersionists claim. It is contrary to common sense to say that baptism is the burial and the burier at the same time. It is equivalent to saying that the sexton, who buries the dead, is both a burial and a burier at the same time. The burial is in the present tense, "we are buried by baptism into death," not were buried. It is impossible for a person to be buried and exhumed at the same time ; therefore immersion, which is only momentary, does not fitly represent that state to which the apostle refers. This Scripture has no reference, either to water baptism, or its mode of administration. The baptism is spiritual by which the old man of sin is crucified, dead, and put off, and the new man is put on renewed in righteousness.

There is no historical proof that in the first centuries of the Christian era, baptism was administered exclusively by immersion. We admit that after the

Church became corrupt, that immersion with many other absurdities was practiced ; but not in the same manner it is at present. "The ancient Christians, when they were baptized by immersion, were all baptized naked, whether they were men, women or children. They thought it better represented the putting off of the old man, and also the nakedness of Christ on the cross ; moreover, as baptism is a washing, they judged it should be the washing of the body, not of the clothes." * Mr. Campbell appeals to the practice of the early Church ; but why did he not insist on the administration of this rite with all of the accompanying ceremonies employed by these early Christians? There is as much evidence from history for the practice of baptizing naked, as there is that immersion alone is baptism. But the question as to the mode of baptism employed in the primitive Church is forever settled by the representations of this rite found in the catacombs of Rome. The catacombs were used for the burial of the dead, and, in the time of persecution, for a place of refuge by the Christians. They were in use in the time of the apostles, some of whom, no doubt, were buried in them. And it was the custom of these Christians to paint or carve upon the walls of their tombs representations of the various customs and rites of the Church then in vogue. But out of about sixteen examples of the rite of baptism there is not a single

*Wall.

instance where the mode is represented by immersion. Baptismal founts have been found in a good state of preservation, that have unquestionably been used in the administration of this ordinance by sprinkling ; but there is nothing whatever to show that they ever practiced any other mode. Now, if immersion had been the mode employed in the primitive Church, is it reasonable to suppose, that these Roman Christians would have invariably pictured the mode by affusion ? There is no person of any intelligence, unless so biased that he will not see the truth, that will form any such an opinion.

We have seen, then, that the places where baptisms were anciently performed were the populous cities and the barren wilderness, the private houses and the public jail, the crowded streets and the desert road-side, all of which go to show that it was not by immersion. We find that the rite was not performed in the Jordan, but beyond it. And that a place was sought for a baptismal station where there were some springs of pure water, in order to supply the people with drinking water, and not a place of "much water" for the purpose of immersion. We learn that baptism was not alluded to, and explained under the figure of a death, burial, and resurrection. And that history reveals the fact that the ancient Church did not practice immersion. Immersion, therefore, can not be the scriptural mode of baptism.

Hence, we conclude that all the doctrines which are based upon the assumption that it is the mode of baptism are necessarily false.



CHAPTER X.

THE SPIRIT OR THE WORD—WHICH?

“Now we can not separate the Spirit and word of God, and ascribe so much power to the one and so much to the other; for so did not the apostles. Whatever the word does, the Spirit does; and whatever the Spirit does in the work of converting men, the word does. We neither believe nor teach abstract Spirit nor abstract word, but word and Spirit, Spirit and word. . . . The Master knew that to wait for health before we went to the physician; to seek for warmth before we approach the fire; to wait till we ceased to be hungry before we approached the table, was not reasonable. And therefore he never asked, as he never expected, any one to feel like a Christian before he was immersed and began to live like a Christian.”

Christian System, pp. 64, 243.

Consistency compelled the author of Campbellism to deny any direct operation of the Holy Spirit upon the heart, either before or after conversion. For had it been granted that the Spirit did witness to the adoption of the sinner into the family of God, and a person believed, reformed and was immersed, and he did not receive this witness, it would either prove that immersion was not “the act of turning to God,” or it would necessitate the repetition of this act until he did receive the evidence of his acceptance. It would be equally disastrous to the doctrine of salvation by water to admit the operation of the Spirit in either case. And there would be no way

left to refute the claim of those who testify that they have received the witness of the Spirit without water baptism. It became necessary, therefore, in order that this system might be consistent with itself and at the same time invalidate all other claims, to teach that the Holy Ghost does not operate directly or immediately upon the heart of either saint or sinner.

This whole system is out of harmony with the divine plan of redemption and salvation; for it is clearly set forth in the Bible that the Holy Trinity is engaged in bringing the world back to righteousness. It reveals the fact that the Father provided the plan and sent the Son into the world to die in our stead; and that the Father and the Son have sent the Holy Spirit to carry on and complete the work of salvation. The claim that the Spirit and the Word are the same—there being neither abstract Spirit nor abstract Word—is virtually a denial of the personality and divinity of the third person of the God-head. If it does not do this, language conveys no meaning. At least it so limits God's power that he can not manifest himself in the world unless aided by men in the distribution of the Scriptures. When we examine the statement that there is neither abstract Spirit nor abstract Word, in the light of revealed truth, we are led to believe that this theory was evolved for the purpose of explaining away those texts

that speak of the work of the Spirit; but we have the relation that the Spirit and the Word sustain to each other defined in the Word itself. In giving the Christian instruction how to equip himself for conflict against evil, Paul says: "Take the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God. (Eph. vi, 17.) The Word is not the Spirit but the sword of the Spirit. It is just as reasonable to say that we can not separate a soldier and his sword, and ascribe so much power to the one and so much to the other, as it is to declare that we can not distinguish between the Spirit and the Word. Has the soldier no power to act independent of his sword? This weapon of warfare is powerless of itself, and is effective only when wielded by the arm of the soldier. Likewise the Word is powerless of itself, and its teachings are only made effective, when enforced by the Holy Spirit. The Spirit follows up the Word, and causes it to produce conviction in the heart of the sinner. He accompanies it, when read by the saint, and makes it a comfort to him. But it is nonsense to say that the Spirit can not act independent of the Word. Unless we are to understand that a soldier and his sword are one, we must believe that the Spirit and the Word are separate and distinct from each other.

If the Spirit and the Word are concrete, then, all

of the power and effectiveness that the Word now has must have been given it when the holy men of old were moved by divine inspiration to write it. And the Holy Spirit since that time has been no more in the Word, than a deceased writer is now in a letter that he may have written. And whatever conviction the sinner is made to feel comes from the Word alone, and whatever joy the saint receives is from reading the promises the Word contains, which he reasons he enjoys because it says they are for him. And if the literal Word is the Spirit, strictly speaking, we do not at the present time have the Spirit of God. For the original Scriptures were written in manuscript form in the Hebrew and Greek languages, and these manuscripts are no longer in existence. They wore out by constant use, and we only have the copies that were made from them. And if we regard the Bible when printed in the original language as inspired, only those who can read these dead tongues can have access to the Spirit of God. The English Bible is not inspired, it is nothing more than a translation of the Word from these dead languages. And unless the Holy Spirit does accompany the Word by his personal presence, independent of the naked words we are without the Spirit. But the inspired Word is no more the Spirit of God than the writings of a man are his spirit.

If the Holy Spirit does not impress himself upon the heart aside from the Word of truth, it can only be by meditation on the Word and by a process of deductive reasoning, that the Christian may experience peace or joy. It is impossible for him to know that he is saved, for all the knowledge he can have of his acceptance with God is that he believes that he understands the gospel plan of salvation, and according to his fallible interpretation of the teachings of the Word, he has complied with its requirements. According to this system, a person is saved by a syllogism. Immersion is for the remission of sins; I have been immersed; and, therefore, I am saved. All the assurance he has is the result of this subjective mental process of reasoning. The evidence of his acceptance with God is not wrought in him by a personal communication to the soul, but is the outcome of his obedience to what he thinks the Word requires of him. He believes that he has fulfilled all the necessary conditions to salvation; and, therefore, that he has a perfect right to claim that he is in a saved state. It is a mere deduction from the fact that he supposes he has obeyed the commandments of Christ. If asked to give a reason for the hope that is in him, all he can say is, "I have believed and been immersed." The change that takes place in the sinner's feelings when he is immersed is produced by his own efforts al-

together, and all the source of joy and peace he has is the approval of his own conscience for doing what he supposes to be right. The act of pardon takes place in the divine mind alone, at the moment the sinner is immersed, and the only evidence that he has of his pardon is that he has obeyed the commandment he thinks was given, in order that he might obtain the forgiveness of his sins. This system is as cold and cheerless as the grave. There is no direct witness of the Spirit in the whole process. Suppose a person falls from grace, the possibility of which is not denied, what evidence can he have of his reinstatement? He can not look back to his immersion, for that was for the remission of his past sins. If he prays for forgiveness, as these teachers say that a citizen of the kingdom has a right to do, it will bring him no sense of his reconciliation with God, unless he predicates it upon the fact that his prayer was very loud and long that his sins might be pardoned.

Mr. Campbell says: "As all the influence which my spirit has exerted upon other spirits, at home or abroad, has been the stipulated signs of ideas, of spiritual operations by my written or spoken word; so believe I, that all the influence of God's good Spirit, now felt in the way of conviction or consolation, in the four quarters of the globe, is by the Word written, read and heard, which is called the

living oracles.” * There certainly is nothing in the constitution of the mind that would render it impossible for God to impress us directly through it without the aid of words as the signs of ideas. Mr. Campbell may have believed that all the influence he exerted over others was by his written or spoken words, but his believing it does not make it so. If he had not exerted an influence beyond the bare language he employed in speaking and writing, he never could have been the founder of this system of faith that bears his name. If it is true that all the moral power we have over our fellow men is the direct result of the words we employ, then all that can use equally good language have the same influence. But we know that this is not the case, for a man’s character has much to do with his influence. Take a man in whom the people have no confidence, and no matter how eloquent he may be, all that he says has no effect upon them. But let another person speak, in whose integrity the people have confidence, and, notwithstanding the fact that his language may be defective, what he says will do those that hear him great good. Besides this, there is something that we call in a speaker a commanding presence, and if he does not possess this, he can not have the influence over an audience that another person can who does have this power. There is also

* “*Milennial Harbinger*,” Vol. VI, p. 356.

something that we call personal magnetism. And the one who possesses this something in a high degree will sway the people with his will, but the person who has little magnetism about him, though he uses the best of language, will have scarcely any influence over those that hear him. Now in all these cases there is an influence exerted which is distinct from the stipulated signs of ideas employed, and is more potent in its effect than the outward symbols that are used to convey the thought to the minds of others, and if it is possible for a man to exert such an influence over the minds of others, independent of the naked words he employs, can not the Holy Spirit operate upon the heart without the help of the Word of truth? Shall we limit the power of the Almighty, and ascribe less to him than to man? Surely if man can exercise such a power as this, distinct from his words, God can manifest himself to us without the intervention of his written Word. If this is not true, then Satan exercises a greater influence for evil in the world than God can possibly exercise for good; for he can tempt men to commit sin, while God can not influence them to do right unless he can secure some one to go to them with the Bible.

According to the plain and unmistakable teaching of the Scriptures, the Holy Spirit reproves the sinner, witnesses to his adoption, and is an abiding

presence in the heart of the saint. In this system of doctrines there is no recognition of any of these offices of the Spirit. And that the Spirit in any way, aside from the word, convinces of sin is bitterly antagonized. The judgment is simply convinced by hearing the Word read or expounded. But the Spirit itself quickens the conscience of the sinner, reveals to him his lost condition, and presses upon him the obligation he is under to serve God. But it is not claimed that this entirely sets aside every other agency. It is not without a knowledge of the truth; it is not without some intellectual conviction; and it is not without some degree of faith. But men may know the truth, be convinced of their duty, and believe that Christ was the Son of God; yet in addition to this they need the direct influence of the Spirit to cause them to act. Before there was any written Word the Holy Spirit is represented as striving with men to bring them to repentance. The Lord declares unto the antediluvians: "My Spirit shall not always strive with man." This does not mean that Noah should not always preach to them, for they certainly knew that he would die, therefore such a declaration would be meaningless. And, under the law, the wicked are spoken of as grieving and resisting the Spirit. How would it be possible for them to do this unless the Spirit strove with them? How could they grieve the Word? When David,

who had turned from the path of rectitude, was led to repentance, he prayed to God: "Take not thy Holy Spirit from me." Was he afraid that he would be deprived of the written Word? Certainly not; it was the reproving Spirit that he did not want taken from him, for he realized that his case would be hopeless if the Spirit ceased to strive with him. That he did not have the Holy Spirit in any other sense is evident, for he immediately cries: "Restore unto me the joy of salvation and uphold me with thy free Spirit." That the Spirit convinces of sin is clearly set forth in the discourses of the Lord and the writings of the apostles. Christ tells his disciples that when the Holy Spirit comes, "He will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment." (John xvi, 8.). The operation of the Spirit, as here indicated, can not be restricted to the Church. And this passage can not mean that the Spirit will reprove the world of sin by the Word only. The Saviour, in explaining to his disciples the promised Comforter that should be sent when he goes away, speaks of him as "the Spirit of truth" and "the Holy Ghost;" but not once as "the Word of truth" or "the Word of God." Hence we must understand that the Spirit convinces the wicked of sin by direct operation upon their consciences. If he was to come to the followers of Christ as an abiding presence, which is undoubtedly the case,

then he comes to the world directly and reproves it of sin, and not simply as the written Word is read or heard expounded.

Jesus said to the unbelieving Jews: "No man can come to me except the Father draw him." (John vi, 44.) Now the question is, how does the Father draw men to Christ? Is it by the hearing of the Word alone, or is it by the immediate influence of the Spirit upon the heart? It is by the direct operation of the Holy Spirit; and we have in the case of Lydia a practical illustration of this immediate influence, aside from the spoken Word, in drawing the sinner to the Saviour. It is said of her: "Whose heart the Lord opened, that she attended unto the things which were spoken of Paul." (Acts xvi. 14.) The things spoken by the apostle were the teachings of the gospel, and these things are all the followers of Campbell claim are necessary to convince men's judgments and bring them to repentance. But it is said here that another agency was brought to bear on this woman's heart. The Lord opened her heart and influenced her to attend to these things. Could the direct influence of the Holy Spirit in convicting and drawing the sinner to the cross be more clearly stated than it is in this case?

Paul did not ascribe the success that attended his ministry to his own preaching of the Word. He had the power to work miracles and had great abil-

ity in presenting the Word of truth, yet he rebukes the persons who were inclined to give him the praise for their conversion. He says: "Paul may plant, Apollos may water; but it is God that giveth the increase." These ministers planted and watered by preaching the Word, but God alone made their preaching effective by the influence of the Holy Spirit, who enforced the Word, causing it to produce conviction in the hearts of their hearers. All of their efforts would have been unavailing without this direct operation of the Spirit upon the minds of the people. The Spirit acted in conjunction with the Word, reproving them of sin and arousing them to action. The Word itself can not make a saving impression on the unsaved, for of itself it is powerless. It is only when it is attended and enforced by the Holy Spirit that sinners are sincerely awakened and are led to seek salvation. But in the work of converting men the office of the Spirit and that of the Word is not the same. Though the Spirit accompanies the Word and makes it effective, yet what the Word does the Spirit does not do, and what the Spirit does the Word does not do.

It is asserted by these teachers that the Spirit can not witness to the acceptance of the person whose sins are pardoned, because it is impossible to receive impressions except through the medium of the senses. And as the eye can not see nor the ear hear

the influence that the Spirit is said to exercise upon the heart in witnessing to the divine acceptance of the saved, therefore such a thing is an absurdity. But that which we learn through an agent is never as real to us as what we see or hear ourselves. We may read or hear the description of a beautiful landscape or a rare work of art, and we can form only a faint conception of the reality. But when we look upon them ourselves, we can have a full realization of their beauty. The senses are merely the agents through which we obtain knowledge of the material world. And that which comes to us through the senses is never as real to us as that which is revealed directly to us without the aid of these agents. All the evidence a person can have of his acceptance with God, according to this system, is by the testimony of the senses; therefore he can have no certain knowledge that his sins are pardoned. He may believe that he is saved at the time, but there will arise in his mind afterwards, doubts of his acceptance. And the only way that he can satisfy himself is by reasoning that he has complied with the requirements of the gospel, as his senses of sight and hearing have revealed them to him, and since he feels that as he has obeyed these, he must be saved. But God does not leave the truly converted soul in any doubt as to the fact of his conversion, for the Holy Spirit comes directly to the heart and bears witness

to his divine acceptance. And this is something that is not reasoned out, or comes to the mind simply through the agency of the senses, but is the result of the direct operation of the Spirit upon our spirits. And we can know this better than the things that we see or hear in the material world, for this knowledge has come to us without the aid of an agent. There is certainly nothing unreasonable in the witness of the Holy Spirit to our spirits, that we have been adopted into the family of God; for the Being who made us is pure Spirit, and it must be in his power to commune with and have immediate access to our spirits. If this is not the case, it is impossible for us to worship God in "spirit and in truth" as it is said in the Word that he seeks such to worship him as come in this way. He has made the conscience so that when we are guilty of sin it condemns us; and there is no reason why he can not impress the conscience with a sense of peace and joy, when he has pardoned our sins. And this is what is said in the Bible does take place "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God they are the sons of God. For ye have not received the spirit of bondage, again to fear, but ye have received the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry Abba, Father. The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God." (Rom. viii, 14-16.)

That all of God's people should receive the wit-

ness of the Spirit was foretold by the prophets: "And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions." (Joel ii, 28.) John declared to the multitude that attended his ministry: "I indeed baptize you with water; but he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost." Jesus promised his disciples that these prophecies should be fulfilled: "For John truly baptized you with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence." (Acts i, 5.) The promise was that the Spirit should be poured out on all flesh, and not upon the apostles, and a few Jews and Gentiles, for the purpose of working miracles. This baptism was received by the one hundred and twenty, and afterwards by the three thousand on the day of Pentecost. In the case of Cornelius and his family, the baptism of the Holy Spirit is spoken of as the witness of their adoption: "And God which knoweth the hearts bear them witness giving them the Holy Ghost even as he did unto us." (Acts xv, 8.) The gift of the Spirit to these Gentiles was the same that was poured out upon the apostles at the beginning, and was given for the same purpose, namely, as the seal of God's love and approval. That this spiritual baptism is the privilege of all believers is put beyond a peradventure, if the

language of inspiration can be given credit ; for it is so frequently mentioned and so often repeated that it becomes all but monotonous. In I. Cor. xii, 13, we read : " For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free, and have all been made to drink into one Spirit." This passage places the fact beyond adoubt, that it is the privilege of the believers of all ages to receive the baptism of the Holy Ghost, by which they are made members of the Church of Christ. It settles forever the controversy whether the baptism was only bestowed upon a few, in order to perform miracles, by proving that it was given to all believers. And this witness of the Spirit was not predicated upon water baptism, but upon faith in Christ : " He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself." He is not left in doubt of his acceptance until after he is baptized, but the moment he exercises faith in the Son of God, he has the witness in himself that he is a child of God. We adduce one more text to show that the evidence of our adoption does not come to us through the Word, or an outward rite, but is by the direct operation of the Holy Spirit upon the heart : " For as much as ye are manifestly declared to be the Epistles of Christ ministered by us, written not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God ; not in tables of stone, but in fleshly tables of the heart." (II. Cor. iii, 3.)

That the Spirit is promised to believers as an abiding presence is obvious from numerous declarations of the Word. The Saviour told his disciples on that last fatal night that it was expedient for him to go away, but that he would not leave them comfortless. He said: "I will pray the Father and he shall give you another Comforter that he may abide with you forever, even the Spirit of Truth, whom the world can not receive, because it seeth him not neither knoweth him, but ye know him, for he dwelleth with you and shall be in you." (Jno. xvi, 16-17.) Christ had been with his followers in person, and had taught them, aided them, and comforted them in their sorrows. And he tells them that when he goes away he will send them another Comforter to take his place, who shall dwell with them and be in them always. This was something that the world could neither receive nor know. But the world can receive and have a knowledge of the word of truth, therefore, it could not have been the Word that was promised them.

The word ghost is derived from a word that means inmate, inhabitant, guest, and our translators could not have chosen a better term to express this office of the Holy Spirit. The Christian is called in the Scriptures the temple of God: "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and the spirit of God dwelleth in you." (I. Cor. iii, 16.) Again it is said:

“But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit if so be the Spirit of Christ dwelleth in you.” (Rom. viii, 11.) The plain and unmistakable meaning of these texts is that the Holy Spirit is the resident tenant of the soul of every disciple of Christ. And they clearly teach that only those who have the Spirit dwelling in them are true disciples of the Lord.

And this indwelling presence of the Holy Spirit is made the test by which we can know whether we are accepted of God or not: “Examine yourselves, whether ye be in the faith; prove your own selves. Know ye not your own selves, how that Jesus Christ is in you, except ye be reprobates? (II. Cor. xiii, 5.) There is no possibility of explaining the meaning of such passages as these if there is no distinction between the Word and the Spirit. The promises of Christ are, by this doctrine, made meaningless, and the church is left comfortless. But it can not be that these promises are without meaning, and that the true followers of Christ are left without any certain knowledge of their acceptance with God. The Holy Spirit and the word of truth are not the same, but the Spirit itself convicts the sinner of his guilt, bears witness to his adoption into the family of God, and dwells continually in the heart of the saint.

CHAPTER XI.

HISTORICAL FAITH.

“Here I am led to expaciate on a very popular and pernicious error of modern times. That error is, that the nature or power and saving efficacy of faith is not in the truth believed, but in the *nature* of our faith, or in *the manner of believing* the truth. Hence all that unmeaning jargon about the nature of faith, and all those disdainful sneers at what is called ‘historic faith’—as if there could be any faith without history, written or spoken. Let it be again repeated and remembered that there is no other manner of believing a fact than as receiving it as true. If it is not received as true, it is not believed; and, when it is believed, it is no more than regarded as true. This being conceded, then it follows that the efficacy of faith is always in the fact believed or the object received, and not in the nature or manner of believing.”

—*Christian System*, p. 114.

According to this doctrinal scheme, man is not so fallen or depraved as to require any divine assistance to enable him to believe the truths of the gospel. He simply weighs the evidence in the balance of reason, and if he regards the testimony as sufficient to substantiate these truths, he accepts them, if not he rejects them. When he receives the fact as true, for example, that Jesus Christ is the son of God, he has faith. But it admits of no higher degree of faith, than the mere assent of the mind to an historical fact. And this intellectual assent to the truth of the gospel facts, which is properly called “historic faith,”

is not faith at all, in the strictest sense of the word. Faith is more than the belief of testimony, or receiving a fact as true. The belief of the testimony precedes faith, but it is not the faith—that explicit trust in Christ, which the sinner must exercise in order to obtain salvation. In order to be consistent, the founder of this system was compelled to place faith in the plan of salvation before repentance, contrary to the Scripture formula, because the belief of the fact necessarily precedes, but never follows repentance. The fact that it was necessary to adapt the gospel teachings to suit this theory is sufficient of itself to disprove it.

Mr. Campbell attempts to prove that faith is the belief of the fact, by such arguments as the following: “If, on surveying with the eye a beautiful landscape, I am pleased, and on surveying a battle-field strewn with the spoils of death, I am pained,—is it in accordance with truth to say, that the pleasure or the pain received was occasioned by the nature of vision, or the mode of seeing? Was it not the sight, the thing seen, the object of vision, which produced the pleasure and the pain? The action of looking, or the mode of seeing, was in both cases the same; but the things seen, or the objects of vision, were different; consequently the effects produced were different. If on hearing the melody of the grove I am delighted, and on hearing the peals of

thunder breaking in pieces the cloud, dark with horror, hanging over my head, I am terrified,—is the delight or the terror to be ascribed to the manner or nature of hearing or to the thing heard? Is it not the thing heard which produces the delight or the terror? May we not, then, affirm that all the pleasures and pains of sense—all the effects of sensation—are the result, not of the manner in which our five senses are exercised, but of the objects on which they are exercised? ” *

This argument is unsound because it is not founded in fact. The facts are such as to sustain the opposite conclusion. Every one sees things from the standpoint of his previously acquired group of ideas; strictly speaking, no two persons can see the same thing just alike; because it can never happen that two individuals have precisely the same group of ideas relating to any subject. These ideas depend on past experience, education, interests, beliefs and desires. Suppose that several persons stand side by side looking upon a beautiful landscape. What they perceive is the same, but what they apperceive is entirely different. The artist has spread out before him a picture, with light and shade and harmony of color. To the farmer there appears a farm, with fields of grain, meadows, and pasture land. The sportsman apperceives it as a place in which he

* Christian System, p. 115.

might enjoy a day's sport in hunting the game that may be found upon it. And the pleasure that they feel as they gaze on the landscape is not from the thing seen, but from the manner in which they see. That it is not the thing seen which causes the pleasure or pain that a person feels when looking at an object is manifest. A young man who had been raised on a farm came with his father to see the Niagara Falls. And after gazing for a while upon this sublime sight, he said: "Oh, father, what a nice place to wash sheep." This sounds so ludicrous that it seems almost impossible that any one could say such a thing after seeing this grand work of nature. How great the contrast between the exclamation of this young man, and that of the immortal Bascom when he first saw Niagara. Bascom was for a time so overwhelmed by the magnificent view, that he stood transfixed to the spot unable to utter a word, then lifting his hands towards heaven he exclaimed, in a voice filled with rapture: "God of grandeur, what a scene!" If it is the object on which our sense of sight is exercised, and not the manner of seeing, how can the different effect that it produced in these individuals be accounted for; the mode of seeing was the same, but the effects produced were entirely different. This can not be accounted for on any such a theory, but if it is the manner of seeing that pro-

duces the effect, then, the explanation is easy. The young farmer looked upon the Niagara Falls with the group of ideas he had acquired by his past experience on the farm; therefore he saw in the falling water something that would greatly lighten the labor of washing sheep, and his exclamation was natural and in harmony with the mode of his seeing. Dr. Bascom by education and religious training possessed a wholly different group of ideas, and consequently was capable of appreciating this sublime sight. But if it is the object seen that produces the effect, both of these men looking at the same object ought to have seen it exactly alike; and that they did not proves that it is not the thing seen, but the manner of seeing which produces the effect. It is true that a person may be pained on surveying a battle field strewn with the slain, but it is the manner of looking that causes the pain. The sight of the dead in the first battle may produce a lasting impression on the mind, but when a person becomes familiar with such scenes, they have scarcely any effect upon him. And the sight of the dead bodies of the enemy, on account of the hatred one has for them, instead of producing pain, may cause rejoicing.

And it is not the thing heard that gives us pleasure or causes us pain, but the manner in which we hear; for example, two men went to hear a celebrated violinist play. And after listening to him play for

some time, one of them said : "I do wish he would get through tuning his instrument, I would like to hear him play a piece." The other one said : "Hush that is the finest piece of music I ever heard in my life." These persons did not hear alike, but why was it they did not ? It was because the one had a cultivated ear and could appreciate fine music, while the other did not have a trained ear and could not tell, even, that the musician was playing a tune. After long and patient training the ear is brought to recognize the harmony of sounds. And, when that stage is once reached, every tuneful chord causes an answering thrill of joy in the soul, and every discord a quiver of pain. But unless a person has a cultivated ear, or has an ear for music naturally, he can have no appreciation of harmony. It was the manner in which these men heard that delighted the one and made the other tired. A man may hear the "melody of the grove," yet not derive any pleasure from it, but on the contrary it may annoy him. And a person who is superstitious or cowardly may feel terror at the sound of thunder, while another person may feel no sense of fear, whatever, he may be delighted by it, when he thinks of the rain that will come with it to refreshen the earth. And what is true of the senses of seeing and hearing is true of all of them. Hence all the pleasures and pains of sense are the result, not of the objects on

which they are exercised, but in the manner of which our five senses are exercised. Therefore all the arguments that are drawn from the exercise of the senses in support of the belief of the fact, fall to the ground. For, instead of sustaining this theory, they prove that the efficacy of faith is always in the manner of believing, and not in the fact believed.

That it is the manner in which we receive a fact, and not the fact believed that produces the various sensations of pleasure or pain, joy or sorrow within us, can be clearly demonstrated. A single illustration will be sufficient to establish this fact. When the news of the massacre of the French Huguenots, on St. Bartholomew's day, came to the several courts of Europe, it excited very different emotions. It is said that Philip of Spain laughed for the first time in all of his life, while Emperor Maximilian wept over the atrocious crime. Queen Elizabeth received with silence the French Ambassador, in a hall draped with funeral black, and the discomfitted nobleman had to depart without permission to offer his explanation. The Pope ordered the *Te Deum* sung, and celebrated the event as a great Roman victory. It was not the fact that thousands of these Christians were massacred, that caused these persons to laugh and weep, mourn and rejoice, but the manner in which they regarded the fact. Those who were at all humane

were made sad, but those who hated these people rejoiced. If it had been the event itself, not the manner in which it was viewed, that affected these persons, they would all have felt the same in regard to it ; but as the slaughter of these people produced such different emotions in them, it must have been the stand-point from which they looked at the event which delighted some and pained others. And this is equally true in regard to faith ; it is not the fact believed that saves ; but the nature of the faith, or the manner of believing the fact.

The mind runs in the three channels of faith, doubt and unbelief. The unbeliever, of course, has no faith, and the one who doubts a fact does not believe it, therefore he can not have faith. Now, if faith is simply the belief of the fact that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, it is impossible for there to be any degrees in faith. For if a person really believes a fact, he believes it as fully as any other person. Hence there can not be, according to this system, any distinction in the nature, or degree of faith. But the Scriptures speak of "little faith" and "great faith," of "weak faith" and "strong faith," and such expressions must refer to the nature and degree of faith. There is no difference between this so-called faith than that exercised by devils, for they "believe also and tremble." And a whole legion of them came to Jesus in the country of the Gadarenes

and confessed him to be the "Son of God most high." And they were then immersed by the herd of swine, and as they had believed, confessed, and been immersed they must have been saved. Surely there is more faith required of the person seeking salvation than that possessed by devils.

The language of the Ethiopian eunuch is all the proof there is to support the theory, that the belief of the fact that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, is faith. Philip replied to his request for baptism: "If thou believest with all thine heart thou mayest." And if he believed with all his heart, he was already saved, for "with the heart man believeth unto righteousness." And he said: "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." But what did it mean for him to make this confession? It meant the bitterest persecution, and perhaps death. He who became a disciple of Christ at this time placed his life in jeopardy every day. And no one would make such a confession as this, unless he had fully embraced Christ as his personal Saviour. At that day, there could have been no stronger proof of the genuineness of a person's conversion than this statement, but we have no evidence that any other person ever used this formula to declare his faith. Christianity is no longer regarded with contempt; but at the present time it is popular. For a person to stand before a congregation to-day,

and say : "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God," is meaningless. It is an empty form giving no evidence, whatever of saving faith in Christ. In fact, there are thousands of godless men who believe this fact as firmly as any one that now makes this "noble confession," yet they do not have faith. If the belief of the fact that Jesus is the Christ is faith, there is no difference between the faith of the impenitent sinner and that of the most devout saint. But it was necessary to call this intellectual assent to the truth faith, in order to make immersion the "crowning act of man's restoration to God's favor."

But belief and faith are not identical. A man believes many things in which he has no faith. And if a sufficient number of competent witnesses all testify to the truth of a certain fact, he can not well disbelieve it. The evidence that Jesus Christ is the Son of God is so abundant that a reasonable person can not well disbelieve it as a fact; yet he can deny, reject, and disbelieve in him as a personal Saviour. There is no saving efficacy in the belief of this fact of itself, but this is all the faith that Campbellism requires. The saving efficacy of faith is in its nature, or the manner of believing, and not in the fact believed alone. We may believe with all our heart, or we may only give intellectual assent to the truth. And right here is where the great

difficulty arises. There can be historical faith without heart faith, but there can not be heart faith without historical faith. The individual may give the assent of his mind to the fact that Christ is the Saviour of the world, but he can only appropriate it to his salvation by the manner of his believing, or by explicit trust in him for salvation. It all depends on the nature of this faith, for "with the heart"—not the intellect—"man believeth unto righteousness." Saving faith is more than the belief of testimony or regarding a fact as true. Faith is made up of these three ingredients—knowledge, belief and trust. A measure of knowledge of the great central truths of the gospel is essential to faith. And there must necessarily be a belief that these things are true, but an explicit trust in these truths is needed to complete the faith. Trust is the main ingredient—the very life-blood—of faith. There can be no saving faith without it. And it is not a pernicious error, but the gospel truth, that the saving efficacy of faith is not alone in the truth believed, but in the nature of the faith. And all the unmeaning jargon comes from the other side, for historical faith has not a single prop upon which to stand.

CHAPTER XII.

SALVATION BY FAITH ONLY.

“We are accounted righteous before God only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, by faith and not for our own works, or deservings. Wherefore that we are justified by faith only is a most wholesome doctrine and very full of comfort.”

—*Methodist Discipline.*

The doctrine which is set forth in this article of religion, that “faith only” is the one necessary or crowning condition to the salvation of the penitent sinner, has met with the most bitter opposition from the advocates of Campbellism. And it is not at all strange, that they have antagonized the teachings of this article of faith; for it is diametrically opposed to the central idea of their doctrinal system—salvation by water. The method they usually employ in controverting the doctrine of justification by faith is to sever the last part of the article from its connections, and, then, insist that the Methodists teach that the sinner is justified without grace, without the blood of Christ, without works, without the Word, and without obedience. In fact, that the forgiveness of sins is held to be by faith alone, without any other cause or agency, whatever. This is a gross misrepresentation and a willful perversion of the plain declarations of this article. The first part

of the article clearly defines what is meant by the last part of it, and as a whole it sets forth the doctrine of justification as taught in the Word of God. "We are accounted righteous before God only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, by faith and not for our own works, or deservings." It must be plain to any unbiased mind that "faith" here is in direct antithesis with "our own works, or deservings." Hence it is "not by works of righteousness which we have done," that we are justified, or "accounted righteous before God," but "for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ," by the exercise of "faith only" on our part.

This article of faith was not framed to set forth what God by his grace has done, or what Christ has suffered to make salvation possible to fallen man, but simply states that we are justified by faith in Christ, and not by our own works. It was not framed, even, to show what the impenitent sinner must do in order to obtain the pardon of his sins. It says that "we," that is, penitent sinners, "are accounted righteous, on account of the merits of Christ, through the exercise of faith, and not for our own deservings." Christ is the object of the faith; it is for his merits; and faith only is required of the sinner to appropriate these merits to his own justification.

We readily admit that there are other causes of

justification besides faith. There are three distinct and separate causes, commonly called the originating cause, the procuring cause, and the instrumental, or receiving cause. Grace is the first, the blood of Christ is the second, and faith is the third. Man transgressed God's law, fell from his high estate, and was ruined by the fall. And the whole scheme of his redemption and salvation was brought about by the unmerited favor of God. Grace devised the plan of redemption, provided the ransom, and made salvation possible to sinful and disobedient man. "By grace are ye saved." The law had been broken, and the penalty must be enforced. And how we were ransomed is shown by the Scripture: "But God commendeth his love toward us that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us. Much more than being justified by his blood we shall be saved from wrath through him." How the merits of Christ are appropriated, received, by the sinner is clearly set forth in Romans v, 1: "Therefore being justified by faith we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." It does not say that it is by "an act resulting from faith," but simply by faith. In Romans iii, 23-26, these three causes are clearly set forth: "For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God had set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood,

to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that our past, through the forbearance of God ; to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness : that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus." Justification is here attributed to grace, the blood of Christ, and faith, but not one word is said of "an act of faith," or a "believing immersion." And this passage should settle the question forever as to what the causes of justification are. In order that he may throw discredit upon the evangelical doctrine of justification by faith, Mr. Campbell says : "In examining the New Testament, we find that a man is said to be 'Justified by faith,' Rom. v, 1 : Gal. ii, 16, iii, 24. 'Justified freely by his grace,' Rom. iii, 24 ; Titus iii, 7. 'Justified by his blood,' Rom. v, 9. Justified by works,' James ii, 21, 24, 25. 'Justified in or by the name of the Lord Jesus ; I. Cor. vi, 11. 'Justified by Christ,' Gal. ii, 16. 'Justified by knowledge,' Isa. liii, 2. 'It is God that justifies,' Rom. iii, 33, viz. : by these seven means,—by Christ, his name, his blood, by knowledge, grace, faith, and works. Are these all literal ? Is there no room for interpretation here ? He that selects faith out of seven must either act arbitrarily or show his reason ; but the reason does not appear in the text." * Any one that is not hopelessly blind or willfully ignorant must see that four of these

* *Christian System*, p. 247.

so-called causes are but one and the same cause stated in different language. By Christ, his name, his blood, and his knowledge, when properly stated, are by "the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." And this only leaves faith, grace, and works as possible causes of justification. The first two are affirmed and the last one positively set aside by St. Paul, he says: "By grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God; not of works lest any man should boast." (Eph. ii, 8-9.) It is under the head of works that immersion is claimed to be the "immediate cause" of justification; therefore it is set aside by this text as having nothing whatever to do with the salvation of the sinner. If it is the act by which he turns to God, he certainly has something whereof to boast.

It is true that this term "only" is exclusive, but it does not exclude the grace of God. On the contrary it recognizes it as the sole originating cause of justification. It receives and appropriates the grace of God. "It is of faith that it might be by grace." It does not exclude the blood of Christ, for justifying faith takes hold of the blood as the meritorious grounds of salvation. It does not exclude God's Word, but heeds it, and is directed by it. It does not exclude obedience, but begets obedience. The faith that is the only receiving cause of justification is not alone, for it has other accompaniments. But

it is only the faith, and not its accompaniments, which enables the sinner to appropriate the merits of Christ, and thus reunite his soul with God. Grace is the sole originating cause of justification, and in this sense it is by grace only. The blood of Christ is its sole procuring cause, and in this sense it is by the blood only. And faith alone is the receiving cause of justification; it is the instrumental means by which the sinner reaches out and appropriates the merits of Christ; and in this sense it is by faith only that he is justified. And by "faith only" is meant that without which no sinner can be saved, no matter what else may be done by him, or what else may have been done for him.

To talk of seven distinct causes of justification only tends to confuse the minds of the people. We do not deny that there are means which are helpful to the sinner in obtaining the forgiveness of his sins. But the advocates of salvation by water persist in confounding these means with the cause, or necessary condition, of pardon. Everything that aids the sinner in the obtainment of forgiveness is a means to that end. But these means have no saving efficacy, and are not conditions on which pardon is granted. God requires faith only as the condition of pardon for sins. But the sinner has become so alienated from God, that he can not comply with this requirement until he repents of his sins. Though

he may have the most godly sorrow for his sins, and weep tears of bitterness ; yet these will not obtain his pardon. He may pray with the greatest earnestness, for the humble penitent always prays, but this will not save him. Repentance and prayer necessarily go before forgiveness, but they are not necessary to pardon, that is, they do not form a part of the condition on which God remits sins. They only bring the sinner into that frame of mind which enables him to exercise that trust in, and reliance upon the merits of Christ, which is necessary for the remission of sins. Hearing the word, repentance, and prayer all precede justification, but only prepare the way for the exercise of faith, which is the only necessary condition of forgiveness. And if there is any inconsistency in teaching that salvation is by faith only, notwithstanding it has other accompaniments, then, Mr. Campbell himself was a very inconsistent man, for he published to the world that "immersion alone was the act of turning to God ;" and yet claimed that faith and reformation must precede this act.

The question under discussion, however, is not what are the causes of, or the means that lead to, the sinner's salvation, but this: what is the conditional cause? This, we contend is faith only. The one thing that the penitent sinner must do is to "believe on the Lord Jesus Christ," and he shall be saved. The followers of Campbell hold that salvation is not

by faith only, but by "an act resulting from faith," that is, by "a believing immersion," which they term the "immediate cause" of justification. And in order to make their theory appear plausible, they quote James ii. 21-24 : "Was not Abraham our father justified by works, when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar? Seest thou how faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect? And the Scripture was fulfilled which saith, Abraham believed God and it was imputed unto him for righteousness: and he was called the friend of God. Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only." The term justification is used in the Scriptures in several different senses. It is employed to denote the justification of the sinner, in the sense of pardon and personal acceptance. This is the justification which Paul speaks of in Acts xiii. 38, 39: "Be it known unto you therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins: and by him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses." And he refers to it again, in Gal. ii, 16: "Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law; for by the works of the law shall no flesh

be justified." But there is another justification, that of the righteous in the sense of approval. And it was in this sense that Abraham was justified, when he had offered Isaac upon the altar. The former is by faith only, but the latter is by works of piety and charity, which are the outgrowth of a living faith.

These two apostles do not contradict each other. James was writing to professed Christians who seemed to think that a mere intellectual faith would save them, while they neglected the plainest duties of the Christian religion. Such dead, inoperative faith could not save them. And he tells them that they must have a living faith that manifests itself in works of charity and piety. He then gives the case of Abraham as an example of living faith, showing them that the faith that had justified him at the time he had believed the promise of God in regard to the birth of Isaac was not dead, but was alive and active at the time he offered his son upon the altar. Paul addresses the unbelieving Jews who sought to justify themselves by the works of the law. And he declares that no man can be justified, in the sense of pardoned, by the deeds of the law. We see, then, that the Christian is justified—approved—by works, and not by faith only. And that the sinner is justified—pardoned—by "faith only," and not by his own "works or deservings."

In the fourth chapter of Romans the question of

Abraham's justification as a sinner is fully treated : "For if Abraham were justified by works, he hath whereof to glory ; but not before God. For what saith the Scripture ? Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness. Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt. But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness. . . How was it then reckoned ? When he was in circumcision, or in uncircumcision ? Not in circumcision, but in uncircumcision. . . Who against hope believed in hope, that he might become the father of many nations, according to that which was spoken, so shall thy seed be. And being not weak in the faith, is considered not his own body now dead, when he was about a hundred years old, neither yet the deadness of Sarah's womb : he staggered not at the promises of God through unbelief ; but was strong in faith, giving glory to God ; and being fully persuaded that, what he had promised, he was able also to perform. And therefore it was imputed to him for righteousness." If the testimony of the apostle can be credited, it is manifest that the father of the faithful was justified—pardoned—before Isaac was born, and at the time he believed the promise relative to his birth. This took place over twenty years before the justification that James speaks of, when

he offered his son upon the altar. And this fact for ever excludes the idea that the sinner is justified by works. The sinner is justified by faith alone, and the righteous man by faith and works.

That salvation is by faith only, and not by water, can be easily proven by an appeal to the teachings of Christ and the apostles. When Jesus began to preach his gospel he said: "The time is fulfilled and the kingdom of God is at hand: repent and believe the gospel." (Mk. i, 15.) He said nothing about a "believing immersion" being necessary in order to enter the kingdom of God. Repentance and faith are all the requirements he mentions. Again he says: "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up: that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life. For God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." (Jno. iii, 14-16.) He did not say he was lifted up that whosoever should perform an "act of faith" should have eternal life. He did not say that God gave his Son, that whosoever performed an "act resulting from faith" in him should have everlasting life. But simply "whosoever believeth in him"—not whosoever performeth an act resulting from belief—"should not perish, but have everlasting life." In John vi, 47, Christ says: "Verily,

verily I say unto you he that believeth on me hath eternal life." Here the possession of eternal life is predicated upon faith, and not upon a "believing immersion." He affirms a direct and immediate connection between the exercise of faith in himself, and the possession of eternal life. The moment a person believes in him he has this life, and not after he has performed an act resulting from his faith.

The Saviour forgave sins while he was here on earth in exact harmony with his teachings, by faith only, and not by a "believing immersion." The first example we have of his forgiving sins was the case of the paralytic, who was let down into his presence by some of the sick man's friends. "When Jesus saw their faith, he said unto the sick of the palsy, Son, thy sins be forgiven thee." His sins were forgiven simply upon the exercise of faith. Nothing more was required, but seeing their faith, he said, "thy sins be forgiven thee." The next instance of Christ forgiving sins was that of the sinning woman. She came weeping and trembling, and falling at his feet humbly sued for pardon. "And he said unto her, thy sins are forgiven thee. . Thy faith hath saved thee." He did not say to her, "Your faith is all right, and your repentance and confession are genuine, but you must be baptized for the remission of your sins." Did he say to his disciples; "This woman has heard my Word, believed that I am the Son of God, and


has made a noble confession ; take her, therefore, and wash away her sins in baptism ? ” Did he say to her on their return, “ Thy believing immersion hath saved thee ? ” No, we hear nothing of the kind, though there was nothing to hinder her from being baptized. He told her that her sins were forgiven, and that it was her faith that had saved her. The penitent thief was saved while on the cross, yet he was not baptized. And unless Christ sent out unconverted men to preach his gospel, which is not reasonable, there were, at least, eighty-five persons, who had their sins pardoned by faith alone. And if water baptism was not necessary for the remission of their sins, it is not necessary for the remission of anybody’s sins. The only way to escape this conclusion is to deny that the condition of pardon that Christ preached and required during his personal ministry was not the same that was preached and required by the apostles after his ascension. But the apostles laid down the same condition for the forgiveness of sins, and proclaimed the same gospel that their Master did. Peter says : “ To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins. ” (Acts x. 43.) Paul declares, when asked by the jailer what to do to be saved : “ Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shall be saved, and thy house. ” (Acts xvi, 31.) John teaches us that we are born of God by faith

itself, and not by "an act resulting from faith:" "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God" (I. John v, 1.) They undoubtedly preached and required the condition of pardon in their ministry that the Saviour did in his; therefore "faith only" is the one necessary requisite to salvation from sin.

The central idea of Campbellism is immersion for the remission of sins. Its advocates never preach a sermon touching the forgiveness of sins, that they do not teach that water baptism is the very essence of the gospel, without which no one can possibly be saved. But there is a marked contrast between the sermons of these teachers, and those of Christ and his apostles. There is not a single word said by them about water baptism being the "act of turning to God," but they always and every where declare that salvation is by faith. If water baptism "is the crowning act of man's restoration to God's favor" it is inconceivable that the Lord and his disciples should neglect to mention the fact, that this was the one essential condition in the plan of salvation. The condition on which the salvation of the soul hinges is of too vast importance to be left in such obscurity, yet this is the case, if baptism is for the remission of sins. But the true condition on which sins are remitted is not involved in uncertainty; for it is so frequently men-


tioned and so often repeated in the Scriptures that there can be no doubt as to what it is. Again, and again, salvation is said to be "by faith," "of faith" and "through faith," but never by "an act resulting from faith." Faith is referred to over three hundred times in the Bible as being conditional to the pardon of sins, but water baptism is never mentioned in this connection. It is impossible that these two systems—Campbellism, in which water is so conspicuous, and "the gospel of Christ," in which it is only conspicuous for its absence—can be one and the same, for they are diametrically opposed to each other. One of them is false, for both can not be true. Which, then, shall we believe, the teaching of Alexander Campbell and his followers or that of Jesus Christ and his inspired apostles?

THE END.









BK

7321

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 029 819 194 5